

Contextualization, Importance.
Meredith Townsend -

Asia + Europe.

N.Y. Putnam 1910

p. 81

"Mohammedan proselytism succeeds
in India because it leaves its
converts Asiatics still; &
proselytism fails in India because it
strives to make of its converts
English middle-class men."

43
Current interest in ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ contextualization of ~~it~~ prompts an
examination of ~~the~~ earliest developments of the ~~faith~~ outside the area of
Roman, western culture; in the Syrian communities of the Chh. of the East (Nestorian)
~~centered in Edessa and Antioch~~ from ca. 100 to 226 A.D.

Its ~~principal strengths~~ ^{virtues} help to explain its ~~rapid~~ ^{unstable} expansion across Asia:
~~its Asian distinctiveness, its~~ ^a distinctively Asian character, ~~ascetic~~ intense monastic
activity, ascetic fervor, general orthodoxy ~~despite the stigma of heresy~~, and
flexibility in rapid ~~indigenization~~ ^{adaptation}. But ~~its~~ weaknesses appearing ~~even in this early period~~ which
may throw light on its ~~later~~ almost complete collapse after ~~such spectacular growth~~. Excessive
asceticism, ~~which~~ ^{as} became the popular model of spirituality, can be traced to Tatian.
~~Orthodoxy was made~~ Theology deviated from Biblical norms under the influence of
Tatian's dualistic rejection of the world, ~~in the~~ ^{direction} ~~no~~ ^{of} Bardaisan's syncretistic ~~syncretism~~
pursuit of freedom in the other. ~~The~~ Popular Syria, ~~as~~ ^{reflected} ~~in~~ the Acts of Thomas, ~~was~~ ^{became}
infected with ~~popular superstitions~~ ^{popular superstitions}, ~~at~~ ~~any~~ ~~one~~ ~~time~~ ~~perhaps~~ as the result of a fatal mixture
of the ~~popular~~ of adaptation on the interests of ~~its~~ ⁱⁿ expansion.

PARTNERSHIP

News and notes from six continents to encourage the renewal of church and mission

October 23, 1978 • No. 12

"Contextualization"--
is there a simple
definition?

"Contextualization" is sort of a million dollar word. Can you give us a simple definition?

Joel Belz of the Presbyterian Journal posed this question recently to Harvie M. Conn, professor of missions at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. We found the Belz-Conn interview so helpful we have condensed and adapted it, with many thanks to Belz and the Journal.

* * *

Different situations
call for different
sounds

Conn: In its simplest terms, contextualization means wrestling with the challenge of living as a Christian and sharing the Gospel in different situations. Suppose you want to share the Gospel with your neighbor. You might give him Campus Crusade's "Four Spiritual Laws." You might decide instead to give him Calvinism's "Five Spiritual Laws." Or you might decide that he isn't even ready for one yet! Where do you begin?

Or suppose you want to share the Gospel with someone at your office who's got a major in religion from the University of Pennsylvania. He knows a lot about the history of Christianity--an awful lot, in fact, about the history of everything. How you share the Gospel with him is going to be different from how you do it with your neighbor. It will still be the Gospel, but it's going to sound different. It will be "contextualized."

So contextualization concerns us all. But why is it especially critical in missions?

Because when we take the Gospel to another country, we convey more than we realize. Americans often carry with them their prejudices and their feelings of superiority. It's the feeling that what you've grown up with is the best way.

Even when you learn to accept and appreciate cultural differences, another problem remains. When you received the Gospel, you received it in a particular package. Now, when you go to Jos, Nigeria, or to Buenos Aires, Argentina, the temptation is strong to ask them to accept the Gospel wrapped in exactly the same way.

Are there reasons why contextualization is more critical in 1978 than it was 25 years ago?

Why contextualization
is so critical
today

Yes. People are much more sensitive to oppression of any kind today--physical, economic, political, etc. This is particularly true in Latin America, even among evangelicals. They are very sensitive, for instance, to the over-powering presence of the North American economic consumer culture. When you have a rising call for the people of the world to assert their own identity, then you have real pressure on you to be sensitive about the way you present the Gospel.

Does this have anything to do with the growing maturity of the national churches in the Third World--or does that question itself betray a kind of superior attitude?

Church "transplants"
won't do

Yes, I would say it does. The so-called national church in the Third World is no more and no less mature than our "national" church is. But there is another facet here. Even though the national church has been around in some countries for many years, it sometimes isn't really a national church but just a transplanted North American church. Take away the language difference, and the national church sounds and looks and behaves just like churches in Newark, New Jersey, or Chattanooga, Tennessee. The problem is that that kind of national church won't reach the people of its own country. It isn't sufficiently "contextualized."

Are you asking for a radical change of behavior or just a growing sensitivity--a kind of positive evolution in our behavior?

That's a loaded question. If I use the word "radical," that will turn off a lot of readers. On the other hand, if I talk about "growing sensitivity," that's sort of a mushy word. What it can mean is that I become satisfied simply with my "growing sensitivity"--as though that was all that is needed. Seeing the need for change is only the first of a number of radical steps.

Some examples?

Key U.S. cultural
traits: demand for
success and . . .

Before I give examples, let me say something about culture. Every culture has its own set of rules. Every culture teaches such rules from the word go. From the very start, Americans learn to eat with a knife and fork and spoon. If you throw away your spoon, mama slaps the spoon back in your hand and says, "No! Eat with a spoon!" Meanwhile, mama in Tokyo slaps the chopsticks in her little daughter's hand and says, "No, no, eat with these."

But in addition to more obvious habits, cultural conditioning includes certain attitudes and themes, things that color the way you look at the world around you. One value that is typical of America is the idea of success. And missionaries carry this with them--maybe unwittingly--when they go to a foreign country. And, of course, it is carried by pastors, and all of us, into our work and ministry for Christ here in our own country. We get very concerned if another church around the corner is growing when ours isn't. Those who are driven by success can have a rough time on the mission field. Suppose you're in a Muslim country and you have very few converts. You end up frustrating yourself and misunderstanding the nature of the church.

Another example?

overemphasis on
the individual

Another strong cultural drive in the U.S. is our orientation to the individual. We've been stamped with the American frontier image of the self-sufficient pioneer. We missionaries are the John Waynes of the theological world. What happens, then, is that we look at a chapter like John 3 and we say, "Well, in order to be born again, there's a need for an individual decision." We neglect the fact that John moves back and forth from the singular to the plural throughout the chapter, which sounds like he has something in mind much bigger than just the individual.

In the U.S., when a person wants to get married, he doesn't ask his father's and mother's permission. It's usually his decision. But in most Third World countries, decisions are not made that way. They are made by groups; you could call them "multi-personal" decisions.

Now, when a missionary goes to another culture and starts calling for individual decisions for Christ, he assumes he has a biblical ideal in

mind. Yet he finds that he isn't getting any response. Finally, the day comes when one individual responds. The missionary writes a glowing prayer letter home saying, "Praise the Lord--someone came to know Christ." What the missionary doesn't realize is that that person's coming to Christ may very well be an obstacle to the future growth of the church in that area. Why? Because the likelihood is that that fellow is a maverick in his culture. He's always on the outside, spinning off by himself instead of working with the group. So immediately the rest of the community thinks, "If this fringe fellow is going to come to Christ, then the rest of us won't." So this first convert has closed a door--at least humanly speaking--all because of our own cultural novelty, our emphasis on the individual.

You feel we haven't listened carefully enough to Third World churches. Are there any examples of Third World church thinking which significantly affects a basic theme of our confessional position?

What Third World
can teach us about
place of prayer,
Bible interpretation

The Third World emphasis on prayer is much greater than in our North American churches. Part of that is culturally determined. Because of a high illiteracy rate, prayer in many countries immediately becomes a key that all can use whether or not they can read. They have open-door access to the Father. Also, because of the powerful belief in evil spirits in many cultures, the tremendous fact of being able to go directly to God as a loving, all-powerful father is revolutionary. The result is that many churches adopt the same creeds and confessions that we do, but there's a much richer place for prayer--and that's more biblical than the practice of many of us in our churches.

Is our approach to Scripture affected?

Mine was. Take the Bible's concern for the poor, for instance. Ordinarily, I think, when we read the Sermon on the Mount, we get the impression that Jesus is talking about those who are humble in heart. To be sure, that's part of it. But we don't think beyond that because, in the U.S., we are underexposed to what poverty really is. Overseas I saw what poverty is and what it does. Sometimes it means selling your children. I found girls in prostitution who were sold by their parents because of drought in the country. I saw beggar kids living together in barns. I started seeing all the oppression that the poor go through.

You can't just
"spiritualize"
the poor

With that came a new perspective on what the Bible says about the poor. You begin to realize that you have to do more than just spiritualize and allegorize. I remember leading a Bible class in a beggar home--about 200 kids--and I picked a passage having to do with orphans and the poor. These kids, who were Christians, started talking about what it meant to be poor and what it meant to be orphans. They weren't allegorizing anything. They were taking the Bible at its literal, absolute face value.

I sat there, and all of a sudden I said, "They're right. I've been wrong all these years." Then I started going back to the Old Testament and the New Testament again. All the social legislation that God built in was more than just allegory; God was really interested in people who don't have any money. That helped me understand the Scripture better.

* * *

Lausanne statement on
"contextualization"

[At this point, the interview explored church-mission relationships--a topic we will save for another time.] A useful summary of the need for contextualization in mission is found in the following paragraph from the "Willowbank Report," the statement formulated by John Stott and 32 other

Partnership in Mission

1564 Edge Hill Road
Abington, Pennsylvania 19001, U.S.A.



PARTNERSHIP newsletter is published by Partnership in Mission, the Christian service arm of the National Liberty Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa., U.S.A. PARTNERSHIP is a vehicle for dialogue on renewal of church and mission. It is open to all interested friends and associates of Partnership in Mission, wherever they serve in the six continents in the work of Christ's kingdom. Your response is invited. Material in this issue may be quoted freely, but please credit PARTNERSHIP and give Partnership in Mission address. Thank you.

International Advisory Council: Michael Cassidy, South Africa • A. Morgan Derham, England • Samuel Escobar, Peru • Horace L. Fenton, Jr., U.S.A. • Chandu Ray, Singapore • Paul S. Rees, U.S.A.

mission-related specialists (including Conn) who met in January this year for the Lausanne-sponsored Consultation on Gospel and Culture:

"Sensitive cross-cultural witnesses will not arrive at their sphere of service with a pre-packaged Gospel. They must have a clear grasp of the 'given' truth of the Gospel. But they will fail to communicate successfully if they try to impose this on people without reference to their own cultural situation and that of the people to whom they go. It is only by active, loving engagement with the local people, thinking in their thought patterns, understanding their worldview, listening to their questions, and feeling their burdens, that the whole believing community (of which the missionary is a part) will be able to respond to their need. By common prayer, thought and heart-searching, in dependence on the Holy Spirit, expatriate and local believers may learn together how to present Christ and contextualize the Gospel with an equal degree of faithfulness and relevance."

* * *

Chinese Church
Research Center

In a previous mailing our U.S. readers were introduced to the CCRC, which is directed by Jonathan Chao and associated with the Chinese Graduate School of Theology, Hong Kong. The enclosed interview gives you a taste of what the Center offers its friends and supporters. Regular mailings of such material begin early next year. Let us know if you are interested. (Overseas readers of Partnership will be sent a CCRC brochure and interview on request.)

SCAN analyzes
Charles Taber's
mission concerns

A recent issue of SCAN includes an analysis of the mission theory and concerns of Charles Taber, former editor of Practical Anthropology and editor of the new journal on missiology, Gospel in Context. Single issues of SCAN are \$1.50 (postage included). Subscriptions are \$9 for one year (six issues), \$16 for two years (SCAN is sent air mail to overseas subscribers, at no extra cost). Another special issue of SCAN deals with "Christian Mission and the Utopian Dream," examining what the church in various areas of the world has been saying over the past two years about capitalism, Marxism and socialism. Multiple copies of both issues of SCAN are available at \$1 each for 5 or more copies.

Bonus for new
Gospel in Context
subscribers

1979 subscriptions to Gospel in Context are now being offered, with the current July and October issues included as a bonus. The July issue deals with "Conversion and Culture," featuring two papers on this subject presented at the recent Gospel and Culture consultation by Donald R. Jacobs and Orlando E. Costas. The respondents to Jacobs and Costas are Miriam Adeney, John T. Boberg, Michael Cassidy, Marguerite Kraft, Gottfried Oosterwal, John F. Robinson, F. Kefa Sempangi, Arne Sovik and John Stam. The October issue (in press) deals with how the western captivity to the scientific worldview affects Christian mission. Subscriptions in western countries are \$11 (2 years, \$17); all other countries \$9 (2 years, \$14). Send your order to the U.S. office of Partnership in Mission (address above).

Introduce someone
to Partnership

We will be happy to mail a sample of Partnership newsletter to your friends and colleagues interested in church and mission renewal. Just send us their names and addresses.

Benhardt Yomo Quarshi
Dissertation Proposal
(New Testament)
April 2, 1982.

Contextualization

_____ Fisher _____
D. Th. A.

Paul and the Culture of the Gentiles:
The Corinthian Corpus and Some Methodological Issues.

The Problem:

The problem that this dissertation identifies is a multifaceted one. It has been said, on the one hand, that St. Paul is mostly indebted to Jewish sources and hardly to Gentile sources. St. Paul, it is maintained, used ideas and concepts that are traceable to the Old Testament and other Jewish sources; he probably borrowed from the mystery religions; he did not take much from Hellenistic sources. In short, "St. Paul does not seem to have been the sort of man we should expect to borrow from pagan sources." (B. M. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, Philadelphia, 1964, p. 2).

e.g. W.D. Davies

On the other hand, in an earlier era, Paul was criticized with having "hellenised" Christianity. It was contended by some that Paul relied heavily on ideas from the mystery religions, Gnosticism and Hellenism in general.

The charge against Paul of having "hellenised" Christianity is not common anymore. This is because there seems to be in Pauline studies a drifting toward a consensus, howbeit an unacknowledged one, in favour of Paul's "Jewishness". The question of how much Paul's theology owes to Hellenism and the culture of the Gentiles, generally, is an issue that is far from settled, except by default, and one that must therefore be re-opened. This dissertation plans to re-open this subject because the emerging consensus in favour of Paul's "Jewishness", so long as it remains unchallenged, is prone to misconstruing, and so to failing to recognize and appreciate Paul's wealth of Hellenic theology, and so to lead to a wrong picture of his own theology.

the gospel.

The failure to recognize and appreciate the method of theologising (which leads to a wrong picture of his understanding of the gospel) is in fact a failure to distinguish between what are constants and what are variables, what are essential and what are incidental, what are central and what are peripheral in his theology. In other words, it is a failure to understand how he uses various cultural elements, be they Jewish or Hellenistic. The failure to make these necessary distinctions has led to a situation in which there is the danger of regarding Paul's "Jewishness" as a constant in his understanding of the gospel, that is, the emerging consensus does not rest on achieving an understanding of the way in which Paul's theology transcends cultural commitments on both sides.

The failure, in reality the inability, to determine Paul's method of theologising and so to distinguish the constants and the variables in his theology is in fact due to the lack of a method for doing so. Previous studies of Paul's relationship to the Gentile world have proceeded along thematic lines and made use of the whole of the Pauline Corpus. This means that particular cities at particular times are not dealt with and this means that the various specific contexts of Paul's letters are disregarded. To disregard these contexts, however, is to invalidate any attempt at determining Paul's method of theologising in a particular epistle, and with that, to close the door to the process of distinguishing the constants from the variables in Paul's theology, at least, in a given epistle and context.

From the foregoing considerations, the multifaceted problem can be said to have the following dimensions:

- 1) An unchallenged consensus in favour of Paul's "Jewishness"; this results from

2) the failure, indeed the inability, to do a 'scientific' method of theologizing and/or of using cultural theories, as well as, the failure to distinguish the constants from the variables in Pauline theology that this entails; and this arises from

3) the lack of a method for making the required distinctions and thus for determining Paul's method as well.

Clearly, the second dimension of the problem, as outlined above, is the most important. To solve this dimension of the problem is to take care of the first dimension, and the key to solving the second dimension of the problem is the solution to its third dimension.

Thesis:

It will be shown that far from condemning everything Corinthian as being unchristian, St. Paul's letters to the Corinthians indicate his readiness to use many things, whether language thought or practice (e.g. ICor.2:6f - reference to the mature and to secret and hidden wisdom; ICor.15:29f - reference to the baptism on behalf of the dead) that can be said to belong to Corinthian culture, that is to that very culture that in some ways has created the crisis for his gospel, in order to carry across his point or message to the Corinthians. Furthermore, it will be shown that Paul made an effort toward this process of 'Corinthianization' and this effort will be portrayed by laying bare Paul's method for carrying out this process, a method in which he was ready to condemn, advocate and even reserve value judgement.

It will also be shown that Paul's method of 'Corinthianization' is an indication that he disapproved at some points of the ways in which the Corinthians were carrying out their process

of 'Corinthianization'. Finally, it will be shown that Paul isolate his method in trying to fight the cultural and worldliness in his theology, and it will thus become clear from Paul's method that many of the things that he owes to his "Jewishness" or to Hellenism are variables and not constants. His constants lie elsewhere; they transcend his "Jewishness" and Hellenism per se. (E.g. in ICor.1, the word of the cross is offensive to both Jews and Greeks; in ICor.7, in the field of ethics, Paul moves beyond both asceticism and libertinism). It must be noted that no sharp isolation of Judaism from Hellenism is intended here. The fact that his constants lie elsewhere gives Paul freedom with regard to "Jewish" and "Hellenistic" cultural elements and because of this, an adequate understanding of Paul does not depend on perpetuating a false picture of the isolation of Judaism from Hellenism. This approach turns out to be more adequate to the historical evidence for Paul as a deeply Hellenized Jew.

Method and Procedure:

This study will proceed in the following manner: first, an effort will be made to identify parts of the Corinthian Corpus that can be described, culturally, as Corinthian in nature. The backdrop for this will be provided by the picture of Corinth and its cultural setting as is determinable from any works, historical or religious, of the period of the mid first century A.D. and earlier; Corinth was refounded by Julius Caesar in 46 B.C. The parts so determined as Corinthian in nature will be placed in their cultural setting. Thus the starting point of this study is issues that arise from the Corinthian Corpus itself. The Pauline use of these Corinthian cultural elements will then be examined in an attempt to find out how Corinthian Paul was to the Corinthians and out of this will be developed a method that takes note of the constants and variables in Pauline

theology as far as there are determinate cultural elements in the Corinthian Corpus is concerned.

Put in another way, the third dimension of the problem, as outlined above, will be dealt with first. External sources for and about Corinth offer a unique opportunity to identify in one part of the Pauline Corpus the specific external features and conditions that belong to this city at this particular time (e.g. the existence of mystery religions and what went along with them; the proverbial immorality associated with Corinth). This opens an advantageous position from which to observe just what Paul, in these letters, is adopting for purposes of communication and strategy, details which (just because they belong to this city and to this time) must be variables. To identify these is also to be able to see more clearly what are the constants in Paul's understanding of the gospel; and so to come to a clearer understanding of Paul's method and therefore of his theology.

The following are the projected chapter divisions:

Chapter 1 - Introduction: The Problem.

Chapter 2 - Corinthian Cultural Elements in the Corinthian Corpus.

Chapter 3 - A Corinthian to Corinthians.

Chapter 4 - A Method and its Implications.

Delimitation and Significance:

Unlike many other studies on Paul and his relationship to the Gentile world, this dissertation will not approach the subject from the Pauline Corpus as a whole. Instead, the attempt here is to deal with one city that Paul wrote to and how he sought to reach out to the Christians of that one city in their own cultural setting at a particular time. As the title of the proposal shows, this study is limited to Gentile culture and specifically, Gentile culture as it

is embedded in the Corinthian Church. The reason for this study began in the Corinthian Church, it was the Corinthian Church that Paul had serious problems with and the one that he therefore had to convince and, to get it, try to keep in line. There was a process of development in Paul's relationship with the Corinthians in which there were a number of issues and other exchanges which will all help in determining what remains constant for Paul. The Corinthian Corpus is good for this study also because the exchanges between Paul and the Corinthians, which are underlined further by the existence of a letter in I Corinthians, enable us to know the Corinthian's side of the story.

This dissertation addresses only the Hellenistic aspect of an issue that has a Jewish dimension as well. There is no dichotomy involved here except the realization that dichotomies are possible as far as the origins of cultural elements are concerned. The study to restrict the study to the Hellenistic aspect is done not only to make the subject manageable but also because what Paul says in Judaism and Jewish sources has been adequately dealt with so that the neglect of the issue of Hellenism tends to let the Christians fall into supposing that the Jewish elements in Paul are his constants. The significance of this study, it is hoped, will be to help present Paul much more sharply and clearly in the culture to which he addressed himself, at least, as far as I and II Corinthians are concerned. (The ultimate aim behind this study though, is to lay a foundation on the basis of which, negatively or positively, African theologians will be challenged to rethink their methods of theologising and searching for an African theology. To pose this challenge is however not part of this study).

Resources: It is hoped that materials in Space and Time here libraries will prove adequate for this study. Some materials needed but not available in these libraries will be purchased and called into service.

THE PLACE OF CONTEXTUALIZATION

by
Chris Jenkins

EC 11 Modern Mission and Ecumenics
Mr. Moffett
Fall Semester, 1981-82

"Go", said Jesus, "and make disciples of all the nations, baptize them... and teach them to obey everything I have commanded you." With this last command before his ascension Jesus launched the age of "contextualization", the proclamation and demonstration of the gospel in the context of another culture. Since that time the church has had the difficult and fruitful challenge of translating God's total message in Christ into the cultural languages of other races and political entities.

In order to understand the problems, importance, and potentialities of setting the gospel in the cultural terms of another ethnic group, it is helpful to have some understanding of communication theory. The gospel is a message and in order to be ^sffective it must be communicated in an understandable manner. Examining how communication takes place, is to be the first task of this paper. This will be followed by a discussion of contextualization, its limits and value. Three case studies involving different approaches to contextualization will comprise the final section of this paper.

Principles of Communication

Many people are under the mistaken impression that communication has taken place if what they feel they want to say has been expressed in a way that to them is satisfactory. The result of this error is often a gross misunderstanding between people, not only in the realm of every day conversation but also in the preaching of the gospel. As communicators it is important for us to realize that "meaning" cannot be transferred. We do not communicate meaning but information. The recipient of our message must construct meaning out of the information that we have given to him. If the pieces of information that the communicator shares with another person do not evoke in the recipient's mind the same concepts that they held in the source's mind then a different meaning has been conveyed than was intended.

Kenneth Boulding in his book, The Image, discusses the fact that each person has in his or her mind a mental map-of-life, an "image" of what reality and unreality is. A person internally organizes the information received in the lifetime, creating an image. The image, whether accurate or distorted, is the sum total of information, background, experiences, and the person's interpretation of those factors. These factors come together to form one's concept of the world around oneself. It represents a person's total outlook and includes every area of life. The image encompasses mundane information concerning where one lives, what

clothes one likes to wear, how to get to work. It also encompasses weightier matters such as self-image, life goals, feelings about people, and one's philosophy about the ultimate questions of life's meanings. It is on the basis of the image that one behaves and makes decisions.

Information we have received, past successes and failures, and every other element that makes up our image, predisposes us to act in certain ways in certain situations. It also acts as a grid that affects how new information is dealt with. All incoming information and all new experiences are evaluated and interpreted primarily through the existing mental framework. This fact has tremendous implications for communicating. Communication is not only what is said but is also what is heard.

We have said that what a person communicates is not "meaning" but information. But since it is meaning that the communicator desires to impart, how is meaning constructed in the mind of the hearer? After the communicator (source) delivers a message, the recipient scans his "image" for a model (which is formed by past experiences, environment, etc.) that most accurately matches, in his or her thinking, the information that was received. On the basis of this model, a thought, or an idea, is built. The response this person gives to the source will come from this idea. The appropriateness of the model that a person relates to a given message will determine what value he places on what is said. It

can be seen that it is essential that information have the same or similar value in the mind of the recipient as it does in the mind of the source. Otherwise the recipient will not "hear" what the communicator intended him to hear and miscommunication will take place. In the case of sharing the gospel, this type of misunderstanding can be very damaging.

Information (and the symbols that convey information, i.e., words, gestures, audio, visuals, etc.) must have meaning that is mutually understood between the source and the recipient of information. Without this understanding, communication cannot take place, or only with great difficulty. It is interesting to note that the word communication comes from the Latin word, "communis" -common. There must be a "commonness" established with someone to be able to have communication (Hesselgrave, p.31). That commonness is to be found in mutually shared experience, common ground, and the resulting shared values that are placed on the words and models that represent those experiences. The principle of communication is involvement. True or whole communication demands active participation in the life of the person with whom one wishes to be understood by. This is the basis for the ongoing development of understanding between people. It should be understood that there will never be total equalization of values and models in two peoples minds. If that were a possibility I suppose there would no longer be a reason

2

to communicate because neither person could add anything to the other. But since people do change and grow it is important that they work together at being involved with one another in order that a basic, mutually shared ground of experience may be maintained.

The process of communicating takes place through eleven signal systems. There is no communication between people except through these systems of symbols (Smith, class handouts, p. 1). The eleven systems are these (in order of conscious use): verbal, written, pictorial, audio, kinesics, artifactual, optical, tactile, temporal, spatial, and olfactory. Of course any of these systems can be used quite consciously, but as a general rule, for example, the verbal system is used with more conscious deliberation than is the audio (inflection, volume, etc.) system that accompanies it. We will not explain in detail all the systems but will give some principles that apply to them all and an example as to why they are all important. First of all, the eleven signal systems are co-existing, they are not used in isolation normally. They are equivalent to language. They help people understand one another, they are capable of being used deliberately, they are commonly used in a group, they are primary systems not capable of being broken down into other systems, and finally, they have a "vocabulary" and a "syntax" that is commonly understood. The importance of all the systems can be appreciated when one realizes how much is communicated

through, for example, the artifactual system. This system has to do with the use of objects including clothing, cars, furnishings, personal things. In any culture an impression of another person is formed simply by looking at the kind of clothes he or she wears. The judgement may be totally unfair for better or worse, but the fact is that initial impressions are influenced greatly by what the other person is wearing. This will of course have implications for cross cultural situations (as will all that is discussed in this section). It is also important to keep in mind that systems are rarely used in isolation. Normally two or more systems are used at a time. It is also possible for the systems to contradict one another. This is very important to remember in communicating a message because when there is a conflict, the less consciously used system will be believed rather than the more consciously used one. This has been a source of confusion in the past on both the part of the source of the message and the one receiving the message. When there is a perceived conflict (real or imagined) the recipient is liable to feel that the message is insincere. When a person tells another that he is glad that he is his friend, but his voice inflection communicates disinterest, the person being addressed will tend to doubt what the other has said. Unintentional contradictions take place when the "information" being communicated does not have the same meaning for the parties involved. Quite often a missionary from the

West will endure sacrifice in order to be of service in a geographically difficult and technologically undeveloped place in the world. To him the pain of separation from friends and family, home and cultural familiarity is very real. Yet when he teaches his target audience that there is a cost to be paid in following Christ, he is surprised that he is not taken seriously. The reason for this is that even though his new standard of living is far below what it was in the West, it is still ^much higher than that of his new converts. The fact that he is able to get the "essentials" of life (sugar, coffee, transportation, clothing, etc.-- and all that he needs) tells his target audience that he himself has not made a very great sacrifice (in their eyes). This brings us back to the point that there must be a common ground of experience so that the worth of a given action or communication symbol can be measured. In the case above, the recent converts were not able to measure the sacrifice involved by the missionary because the standards of measure were different. Awareness of the value of all of the eleven systems, from the most to the least obvious set, will have tremendous implications for full contextualization of the gospel.

"When two or more media systems support one another, we believe the message to be sincere. When the media systems contradict each other, we believe the person to be insincere... We tend to believe the less consciously used system." (Smith, class handout, p.14).

As we said above, the construction of meaning takes place in the mind of the hearer. It is an internal and individualistic event. However, in any given culture there will be enough mutually held values for particular signals and information that people can be generally and consistently understood. In spite of these commonly held pools of information, in even the most ideal situation between source and respondent in the same culture, it is estimated by some that only eighty per-cent of the communication that takes place is effective. How much more precarious must communications be in cross-cultural situations? (Hesselgrave, p. 61). Signals often go unnoticed if they have no significance to the intended receiver. In cross-cultural settings, the amount of information that is not grasped for its meaning must be significant. It would well behoove anyone aspiring to deliver the gospel in a culture other than his own to learn the uses of all eleven signal systems of the group to which he is going.

A sometimes overlooked, but relatively obvious need in communication is a mastery of the content of the message to be delivered. Before one can effectively transmit a message to another person, either in a similar or a totally different culture, that person needs to first internalize and be putting into practice what he or she desires to share so that the message can be placed in the mental framework of the other person

without distorting the message. Mastery of content also includes the media, which the message will be communicated through, for the message is shaped both by the content and the use of the system involved in delivering the content. Distortions or irrelevant explanations of the message take place when an individual has not mastered the media and the content of his message.

The process and principles of communication are important. Before effective contextualization can take place, the purpose of contextualization must be clearly understood. It is to put the full meaning of the gospel in symbols and actions that are accurately understood by the recipient in the terms of his or her own world view. Other principles of communication will be discussed in the following section on contextualization.

Contextualization

Culture has been defined as "the integrated system of learned patterns of behavior, ideas and products, characteristic of a society" (Hiebert., p. 25). A culture is the creation of a group of people. This culture expresses the basic assumptions and values about the world that the group of people holds. Behavior patterns are expressions, which are to a very real extent, an expression of what those assumptions about the world are. Behaviour that is linked most closely with the central ideas of the group are most difficult to change while traits associated with that are the periphery of their values and beliefs are much more easily influenced by change.

Different cultures manifest not only different customs and values, but also entirely different ways of looking at the world. Someone once pointed out that people do not simply live in the same world with labels attached, but that they actually live in different worlds (Hiebert, p. 33). This difference in world views affects every aspect of the world we live in. Use of time, space, concepts of hierarchy of life (animals, people, spirits, God or gods), and every other conceivable area of life. A good example of the differences involved would be to compare the Indian concept of time with that of the American concept of time. The American concept is that time is linear. It extends in uniform fashion

along a scale that goes into the future and past without repeating itself. A person must make the most of this life for everyone has only one life to live. A sense of finality pervades the thoughts of the American as he or she goes about the business of living, knowing that there is no chance for a practice run in life. The Indian on the other hand thinks of time as being cyclical. Time continually reruns both people and events in an undending series of experiences, ages, and good and bad fortune. Every one is "born-again" thousands of times in an equal number of different situations and conditions.

The differences that exist between cultures, help account for the experience of "culture shock" that many have reported during or after a trip to another country. Culture shock is not so much a result of new sights and smells and people, it is primarily a result of not knowing how to function in the new setting (Hiebert, The Gospel and Islam, p. 61). Old gestures, artifacts, and spacial relations take on new meanings that have to be learned all over again. During the process of learning the new meanings and symbols one feels as though he or she were cut off from reality and living in a slightly topsy-turvey world. The person is neither able to make himself understood without difficulty nor able to understand the communications of those from the other culture. It is the fact of these two obstacles, the difficulty of communication

in general (see section one) and the reality of greatly varying world views, that make the practice of contextualization so important.

A good explanation of contextualization is offered by Charles Taber:

Contextualization... is the effort to understand and take seriously the specific context of each group and person on its own terms and in all its dimensions -- cultural, religious, social political, economic -- and to discern what the gospel says to the people in that context. This requires a profound empirical analysis of the context in place of flip or a priori judgements... Contextualization tries to discover in Scriptures what God is saying to these people. In other words, contextualization takes very seriously the example of Jesus in the sensitive and careful way he offered each person a gospel tailored to his or her own context (Taber, The Gospel and Islam, p. 146).

So contextualization is the transference of the meaning of the gospel into cultural symbols and actions that are not original^d either to the culture of the Bible or to the one who is attempting to communicate the gospel in the contemporary situation. It is not, nor has it ever been enough to simply learn the language of a people, and to then procede to "preach the gospel" in the newly acquired dialect. This has resulted in the kinds of errors of communication that one would expect to read about only in satires and in caricatures of missions. Since one of the principles of communication is involvement, it is imperative that in order for the gospel to be understood by the target audience, the

missionary immerse himself in the culture of the people he is working with. Only as the world view of the recipients of the gospel is learned and the meanings they ascribe to, the various phenomena around them in their world are comprehended can the communicator of the gospel begin to make the message of Jesus Christ intelligible.

The gospel must address the whole culture in which people live. Every culture stands under the judgement of God as well as under the mercy of God. All the different aspects of culture are comprised of sinful people and therefore no element of culture is beyond being the need for the scrutinizing gaze of the light of the gospel. Cultures, comprised as they are of people, suffer from the same malady as people - total depravity. To put it in a little milder form, no aspect of culture is without the influence and taint of sin. Again as with people, the worst of cultures have redeemable characteristics and the best have areas in need of transformation. It is the responsibility of the missionary to discover what aspects of the culture he is dealing with fall under the judgement of God and therefore must be abandoned or transformed (materialism and immorality in the United States; atheism and aggression in the United Soviet Socialist Republic). Likewise, he or she must be discerning enough to know what elements of the society

are basically sound (some black African family structures, the ideal of freedom for all in the U. S. A.). The missionary must not be afraid to let the people he ministers to adapt their own forms of worship, prayer, houses of worship, and even various cultural activities that might seem illegitimate in our own culture but because the activity conveys a different value in the other culture, it therefore also has different spiritual implications. Nor should the missionary be afraid to employ methods of approach that would seem inappropriate at home, but are essential in the target culture. The principle here seems to be

Christianness lies primarily in the functions served and the meanings conveyed by the cultural forms employed, rather than in the forms themselves... God seeks to use and to cooperate with human beings in the continued use of relative cultural forms to express absolute supracultural meanings. The forms are not important for their own sake, but for the sake of that which they convey.
(C. H. Kraft, p.66)

In other words, meaning is more important than the form.

At this point, some words of caution should be mentioned. I have already said that the missionary must be sensitive to try to discern what aspects of culture are not simply different but actually unChristian. It is true that meaning is more important than form, and that it is meaning which determines the acceptability or nonacceptability of a cultural form. However, using

other than Biblical models and forms has its limits. Even with apparently neutral forms can one be sure that all that was intended to be communicated by the authors of Scripture will be available for reception? Or do some, even basically good, forms still omit truths that the Lord of the church intended the church to have? An example was once heard by this writer of a tribe in Africa which laughed when they heard Jesus being described as a shepherd. The reason for this was that their shepherds were always the young boys and village idiots. To hear of Jesus as a grown man being called a shepherd was to hear him being described as an idiot who could barely take care of himself let alone anyone else. The question is, is this a point at which a dynamic equivalent should be sought? or a point at which reeducation should begin? There are eighteen books in the Old Testament that use the term "shepherd" many times in the context of God raising up a Shepherd for his people. In the New Testament seven books speak of shepherds, and almost always in the context of Jesus Christ. Could an equivalent be found that would fully convey the many implications and meanings that are existant historically and fundamentally in the parallel between shepherd and sheep, and the Lord and his people? If possible, it would be difficult. And if not possible, but pursued, then the new church would be robbed of the insights and strength that could have been gained through having their

Lord revealed to them in one of his primary roles over them: that of shepherd and themselves as his dependant, helpless (apart from him) sheep.

Another consideration is that of the future generations that will come and read the Bibles that have been written for them with dynamic equivalents. These people will also be able to read the Greek and Hebrew texts, and if not these at least good modern translations. What problems will be created for them to discover that the "infallible Word of God" that they have been reading does not say at all what they were told it said? It could also provide opportunities for doubt and mockery of the faith.

The problem of contextualization is not a new one. The apostles lived in a world that rubbed shoulders with many ethnic groups. The stories of how this situation was dealt with can be read in the epistles (Acts 15, Galatians 1, 2, etc.). Paul made explicit statements concerning his attitude towards culture. In I Corinthians 9: 19-22 he basically said that he was willing to adapt himself to any cultural situation for the sake of the gospel. "For though I am free from all men I have made myself slave to all that I might win the more. To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews...I have become all things to all men that I might by all means save some." The only stipulation he made in following this policy was that his cultural

accommodations could not compromise his obedience and faith in Christ. "Paul saw the great gospel message as applicable to all men throughout the world. He longed to see Christianity take root in the soil of every culture. It was not to be just a foreign import. To attain this goal, Paul became all things to all men." (Parshall, p.37).

We will now look briefly at three case studies that exemplify different degrees of accommodation to the culture of the target group.

Case Studies

The first case study took place in the jungles of Bolivia among the Ayore' Indians. After the initial frustration in trying to establish contact with the Ayores, missionary Bill Pencille was able to locate and remain with the Indians for a time. Bill had several goals in mind in trying to serve the Indians. One, he wanted to lead them to Christ through the preached word. Two, he wanted to see them settle down (they were nomadic tribesmen) and receive the benefits of modern civilization. Finally, he hoped to see them become self-sufficient as a people and as a church (once they became Christians). The methods Bill used were questionable. After building a home for himself and his wife on the fringes of Ayore territory, he began the task of trying to get them to come and settle down on his property so that he might preach to them, teach them, and get them to settle down. Unfortunately, much of his time was spent trying to persuade them to stay or going out after them in the brush to bring them back. He preached through a young Ayore boy who had learned the English language, while trying to learn their language. There were sad occasions in which western diseases ravaged their numbers. Though some of the Indians did become Christians most resisted the attempt to "tame" them. Bill never tried to adapt himself to their customs or thoughts. The result was that a bond

never formed between himself and the people he was trying to serve. They never trusted him and he in his turn, neither trusted them nor understood why they were so slow to respond to his efforts and the "truth" he was preaching to them. At times force was used to either bring the Ayores back to the station house or to keep them there once they were on the property. This did not help relations, needless to say. After years of dealing with them in this situation Bill retired and returned to the United States. The Ayores went in several directions. Some went back to wandering in the jungle and tried to pick up where they had left off. A good number of them tried to live in the modern towns that were around the area. This for the most part was a negative thing. Many of these became beggars or poverty stricken individuals who hung around railroad stations looking for handouts. Some did do fairly well though. A handful had become Christians, one even becoming the backbone of a small church.

In evaluating this particular effort, it would have to be said that Bill did not have a grasp of how communication takes place or of how world-views are formed and changed. Though he apparently did love them, he never learned to appreciate their culture, or to help them maintain their personal integrity and self respect while going through the throes of change. His failure to come down to their level culturally or

in communication was a major set back to his efforts to show them the love of God and the truth of the Scriptures. The fact that there was so little to show for his labors is an indication that by not approaching them on their cultural terms, neither the message nor the affection and efforts of Bill took root in their own lives. As soon as the artificial support structures were removed (when Bill left) the Ayores simply walked off to make out the best they could, leaving that "phase" of their lives behind.

The second case took place in the jungles of Columbia. ^(See also page 10) The methods of this missionary were fairly unorthodox by any one's standards and are at the opposite end of the spectrum from Bill Pencille's. Bruce Olson first made contact with a tribe of Indians when he was only nineteen years old. He had ~~left~~ home on his own, totally independent of any one's help, financial or otherwise. After striking out into the jungle alone, he was taken captive by the group of Indians I mentioned above. After some initial difficulties he gained their confidence and was allowed to live with them for a year. At the end of the year he asked them to take him to the group he was most interested in reaching: the Moltipones. He ended up being taken captive by them, shot through the leg with an arrow. After almost dying as a result of his wound and the elements, he was rescued. Within three weeks he was

back in the jungle trying to reestablish his contact with the Moltilonos. This time they let him live with them as a friend, thinking that his God must have brought him back since he was able to live. Bruce totally adopted the Moltilone way of life. Eating, sleeping, working, and social habits were those of the Indians. He learned their language fluently over a period of years and was able to introduce simple medicines to the tribe through the medicine man. He had been with them almost five years when an occasion presented itself in which he not only learned the tribal beliefs concerning the spiritual realm and god, but was also able to make his first presentation of the "gospel" using a dynamic equivalent that he discovered in the tribe. The gospel was later received by a young man whom he had grown close to and who expressed his faith during the evening tribal ritual of exchanging gifts and songs. As a result of this person's faith and witness, almost the whole tribe turned to Christ.

Bruce continued to work with the Indians after they were converted. He helped educate many of them and helped introduce in a gradual way agricultural and technological improvements that greatly aided the Moltilonos. The tribe literally became a model of what Christ could do in a group like the Moltilonos who had a reputation for being murderers.

It is hard to argue with success. Olson's story

has apparently been well documented and the results of his work lasting. Certainly he took exceptional risks and endured unusual hardship for the sake of the vision he had for working among the Indians of Columbia. My positive comments are these. First, Olson is a good example of wholehearted contextualization. Not only did he adapt his message to the cultural situation, but he also adapted himself to that situation. An incarnational mode. He had the wisdom to be able to introduce certain benefits of the modern age through established channels in the tribe and did this without disrupting the Moltipone culture. Olson appreciated the need to allow the Moltipones freedom of expression for their faith. Their music and worship, and every other aspect of their faith was carried out in a tribal way.

My negative comments are these. Bruce took upon himself risks that others also have taken and were killed as a result. His particular method is not really a model that can be freely recommended to other youths (or older Christians) to copy. Nor is detachment from one's home church and refusal to listen to pastors and family the example Scripture gives to follow. Discussing the theological implications would be too lengthy a project to undertake in this paper, but suffice it to say that my main criticisms center around the methodology used in launching out in the first place. On the other hand, if he had not gone the fruit that he bore in Columbia may never have come into existence.

My final example involves another tribal group, this time located in Irian Jaya. The Sawi people were cannibals and headhunters. Don Richardson was commissioned and sent out by the Regions Beyond Missionary Union. He was trained in a Bible college that specialized in preparing candidates for the mission field. After he received his training in college he served as a pastor and youth worker for three years. While he was working as a pastor his future bride was working as a nurse, being trained and receiving experience in that field. After they were married they were flown to Irian Jaya to receive their first assignment. After deciding where to minister they took supplies of food, tools to build with, equipment and artifacts to trade with the tribal people in exchange for their help. They also received regular replenishments of supplies through an aviation fellowship. Upon arriving at the site of their new residence and after greeting the Sawi, they built their home. Their ministry was basically a combination of the two ministries already examined. They brought with them the advantages of the modern world that would make survival a more certain affair. At the same time, however, they knew the importance of contextualization and were prepared to spend the necessary time involved in learning the culture as well as the language. They involved themselves in the daily routine of the Sawi and did not try to impose upon them cultural changes that they were neither ready for nor necessarily

in need of. Over a period of several years the Richardsons were able to discover the keys to the Sawi culture that enabled them to effectively share the gospel with them. It wasn't long before the majority of the people became Christians, coming to Christ in their own cultural terms. As Richardson said, " From now on, any Sawi who rejected Christ would see himself not as denying an alien concept, but rather as rejecting the Fulfiller of the best in his own culture!" (Richardson, p.234).

Don Richardson's efforts were undergirded with personal training and preparation, the support of his church and his missionary organization, and enough material supplies to help both himself and the target group live healthier lives in the jungle. The biggest difference between Don's work and that of Pencille's was that Pencille tried to control his people and force them to learn his ways while never valuing theirs or understanding the importance of context for the message of Christ. Don lived with his in mutual coexistence and tried to learn their ways in order to communicate with them on their terms. He also had an advantage over Bruce Olson in that he had the spiritual and relational backing of those people who were, in God's planning, significant individuals in his life. And the results of his ministry were equally impressive. It is a model that can be recommended and encouraged even though it no doubt is not a perfect example either.

and contextualization in respecting and using the cultures of other peoples, and from the three case studies whose fruits reflect the methods used, it can be seen that contextualization is not a concept that will lose its validity and urgency with the passing of years and the discovery of "new methods." God has called us to go into every person's world with the gospel of Jesus Christ. Putting this message into the context of the culture being approached is certainly a necessary element in the faithful proclamation and demonstration of God's saving work.

A... The... and...

Bibliography

- Hesselgrave, David J. Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Hiebert, Paul G. Cultural Anthropology. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1976.
- McCurry, Don M. The Gospel and Islam: A 1978 Compendium. Monrovia: Missions Advanced Research and Communication Center, A ministry of World Vision International, 1979.
- Olson, Bruce E. Bruchko. Carol Stream: Creation House, 1978.
- Parshall, Phil. New Paths in Muslim Evangelism. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Richardson, Don. Peace Child. Glendale: Regal Books Division, G/L Publications, 1974.
- Smith, Donald. Class notes; Handouts. Daystar Communications, Nairobi, Kenya, 1978.
- Wagner, C. Peter, Defeat of the Bird God, S. Pasadena: William Carey Library, 3rd printing 1975.

CONTEXTUALIZATION

Contextualization is defined as putting words together in a meaningful way. Therefore, the question we need to ask is: Are the words we use for explaining the Gospel a meaningful combination of words to the masses outside of Christ? The question needs to be answered in full knowledge of what the words have come to mean in the 100+ years since the last entrance of the Gospel into Taiwan.

- I. Christianity to the masses on Taiwan is a foreign religion
 - A. Christianity is under the Foreign Affairs Bureau and is officially considered a foreign religion.
 - B. Christianity is recognized by the common people as a foreign religion.
 1. Ancestors are not visibly honored.
 - a. For over 60 years the requirement for joining church was a public burning of ancestral tablets.
 - b. Christianity has not recognized nor practiced a meaningful and visible honoring of ancestors in the home, in the funeral and at the grave.
 - c. Christianity's most common approach of reaching the young people and children first without the consent of the parents keeps Christianity the number one enemy of the ancestors today.
 2. Christianity as it effects the Taiwanese, Hakka and Tribal peoples to this very day is foreign in the use of Roman symbols in the Bibles and songbooks.
 3. Almost every visible expression of the Church is Western - Festivals, Music, Color, Architecture, etc.
- II. Contextualization in the Old Testament. (Brief & Abridged)
 - A. God used proverbs of that day to make clear His communication.
 1. In Ex.3:8 God told Moses out of the burning bush that He would take Israel to a "land flowing with milk and honey" - a Semitic proverb of that day meaning "plenty".
 2. In Ex.11:7 God told Moses that when the angel would pass over Israelite homes "not a dog shall wag his tongue" - a Semitic proverb of that day meaning perfect calm and peace.
 - B. God appropriated practices of that day to make clear His actions.
 1. In Gen.15:7-21 God confirmed His covenant with Abram by passing between the halves of sacrificial victims just like two parties of that day would confirm a covenant between them.
 2. In Gen.17:9-14 God appropriated a common tribal mark of that day (circumcision) as the mark of His covenant with Abram and his descendants.
 - C. Christ was a contextualization of God's Word in Jewish flesh.
 1. He had a detailed record of His ancestry. Mt.1, Lk.3
 2. His longest recorded sermon (Mt.5,6,7) wrapped the Word in Jewish illustrations and life of the first century A.D.
 3. His discourses and sermons were in Jewish realities (Jn.4) and life (Lk.8) and not in theoretical doctrines.
 - D. The Holy Spirit, Apostles and Early Church contextualized the Gospel.
 1. Acts 2:6-8 records that the Holy Spirit caused everyone to hear the Gospel in his own local dialect.
 2. The Hebrew "Messiah", "Jeshuah", etc. were not transliterated, but the actual Aramaic and Greek words having the identical meaning were used - Christ Jesus etc.
 3. The term "hades" was taken from Greek mythology where Hades was the god of the lower regions. "The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary" page 328
 4. Slavery was acknowledged (Eph.6:5) as a practice of that day.

5. Early Christians washed each others feet and kissed each other when meeting because it was the custom in that area.

III. Can the Chinese Church contextualize the Gospel to the extent that God wrapped His communications in Ancient Semitic flesh, Christ wrapped His communication in first century Jewish flesh, and the Holy Spirit wrapped and is wrapping His communication in the particular flesh of each tribe and people and nation where He indwells the Christian?

With nationalism at a pitch seldom surpassed in history (most recently seen in the Olympic Games in Canada), with the National Chinese Government calling for a revival of Chinese Culture, can the Chinese Church more effectively reach the unsaved and glorify God in a Chinese way by being a better Chinese than the unsaved Chinese. I say an unqualified YES!!!

- A. Can Chinese Christians SHOW the unsaved that they do honor their ancestors by having:
 1. A prominent chart of their ancestry?
 2. Good pictures of recent ancestors on the wall?
 3. Flowers in memory of their ancestors?
 4. Big funerals with parading and eating by MANY Christians to show their sorrow and oneness with the bereaved brother or sister in Christ?
 5. The prettiest and best kept graves in the graveyard?
 6. Memorial services on the anniversary of the birth and death of the ancestor?
 7. Memorial services each week for the first seven weeks after the death of an ancestor?
- B. Can Chinese Christians have the Gospel in Chinese Rhyme and sung to Chinese Tunes?
- C. Can Chinese Christians have a full God-honoring social life like the Jews of the Old Testament(Ex.23), Jesus(Mt.9), and the Early Christians?
 1. By eating together often.
 2. By observing Chinese Festivals to the Glory of God.
 - a. Chinese New Year instead of Christmas
 - b. Grave Sweeping Festival instead of Easter
- D. Can Chinese Christians give a cup of tea or pass out tracts with two hands to show respect to the person they approach?
- E. Can Chinese Christians bow & clasp their hands & call each other by terms fitting their relation with each other?
- F. Can Chinese Churches be beautiful as the Tabernacle or Solomon's Temple with Chinese Red(Joy) and gold and blue and purple(Ex.25)?

"For though I am free from all men(I don't have to be like the Chinese), I have made myself a slave(to all that is Chinese) to all, that I might win the more." I Cor.9:19 We are not sent to the Church but sent to the world of unsaved. The Pastor helps each Christian to fulfill his ministry of being a testimony to Christ at home; work and recreation. When the unsaved Chinese sees the fullness of a Chinese Christian life they will be drawn irresistably to Christ.

Just like the Judaizers fought to circumcise the Gentile Christians and keep them from eating pork, the Preachers and Older Chinese Christians will fight to keep "Christianity" for what they have known it to be. (If the King James was good enough for St. Paul, its good enough for me.) Change in religious forms is almost as traumatic as losing a member of

the family. Change, therefore, MUST COME SLOWLY AND WITH AS MUCH AGREEMENT AS POSSIBLE. The only reason for change is to make the Gospel an open option to the masses outside of Christ. A foreign religion is NOT an open option.

Ernest J. Boehr, Box 60, Miaoli 360

The following is an attempt to "think" the thoughts of an unchurched Taiwanese upon hearing a non-contextualized message. The thoughts of the unchurched are in parenthesis.

"Today I would like to speak to you about how much YehSoo (That religious leader opposed to our ancestors) loves us. (How can anyone destroying our ancestors love us. We depend on our ancestors for all.) Let me first read from the Holy Classics (Wonder what that book might be). In LooJya (Road Add) Happy News (This teaching is really foreign) the 15th chapter, verses 1-7, YehSoo tells the story of 100 wool goats. I will read the verses for you. 'Now all the tax-gatherers (No one gathers taxes here, we've got to take our money to the office) and the sinners (They must have been caught by the police.) were coming to YehSoo to listen to Him. And both the FahLeeSai (Law, Profit, Race) and the literary men began to grumble, saying, "This man receives sinners and eats with them." And YehSoo told them a parable saying, "What man among you, if he has 100 wool goats and has lost one of them, does not leave the 99 in open pasture, and go after the one which is lost, until he finds it? (That's crazy. The 99 would run away while he'd be looking for one) And when he comes home, he calls together his friends and his neighbors, saying to them, 'Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost.' I tell you that in the same way there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents, than over 99 righteous persons who need no repentance." ' "

"The shepherd described here is YehSoo. The lost wool goats describe us sinners, for we have all come short of God's standard (I haven't been caught at stealing nor have I killed any animal life. Furthermore, I'm no goat nor does a shepherd love his goats - he raises them for wool and meat.) YehSoo and His Father love us so much that even though we ran away from Him (I never entered a foreign religion. I'm faithful to my ancestors) the Heavenly Father sent His son YehSoo to this world (I wonder whom He calls the Heavenly Father! The Heavenly Mother must be Matsu) to die for our sins on the cross (We Chinese have had many wonderful men who gave their lives for justice and truth, what has YehSoo to do with me? What is a cross and how did YehSoo get on it to die?). YehSoo loves us so much that He and all heaven rejoice when one person trusts Him and becomes part of God's family (Who is this God - Tyan Gung?). Won't you trust in YehSoo and have your sins forgiven. You'll have peace and joy now and when you leave this earth, you will be forever with YehSoo in heaven (I'd rather be with my loved ones and friends in hell than go where I don't know anybody in a foreign place).

CONTEXTUALIZATION

Contextualization is defined as putting words together in a meaningful way. Therefore, the question we need to ask is: Are the words we use for explaining the Gospel a meaningful combination of words to the masses outside of Christ? The question needs to be answered in full knowledge of what the words have come to mean in the 100+ years since the last entrance of the Gospel into Taiwan.

I. Christianity to the masses on Taiwan is a foreign religion

- A. Christianity is under the Foreign Affairs Bureau and is officially considered a foreign religion.
- B. Christianity is recognized by the common people as a foreign religion.
 - 1. Ancestors are not visibly honored.
 - a. For over 60 years the requirement for joining church was a public burning of ancestral tablets.
 - b. Christianity has not recognized nor practiced a meaningful and visible honoring of ancestors in the home, in the funeral and at the grave.
 - c. Christianity's most common approach of reaching the young people and children first without the consent of the parents keeps Christianity the number one enemy of the ancestors today.
 - 2. Christianity as it effects the Taiwanese, Hakka and Tribal peoples to this very day is foreign in the use of Roman symbols in the Bibles and songbooks.
 - 3. Almost every visible expression of the Church is Western - Festivals, Music, Color, Architecture, etc.

II. Contextualization in the Old Testament. (Brief & Abridged)

- A. God used proverbs of that day to make clear His communication.
 - 1. In Ex.3:8 God told Moses out of the burning bush that He would take Israel to a "land flowing with milk and honey" - a Semitic proverb of that day meaning "plenty".
 - 2. In Ex.11:7 God told Moses that when the angel would pass over Israelite homes "not a dog shall wag his tongue" - a Semitic proverb of that day meaning perfect calm and peace.
- B. God appropriated practices of that day to make clear His actions.
 - 1. In Gen.15:7-21 God confirmed His covenant with Abram by passing between the halves of sacrificial victims just like two parties of that day would confirm a covenant between them.
 - 2. In Gen.17:9-14 God appropriated a common tribal mark of that day (circumcision) as the mark of His covenant with Abram and his descendants.
- C. Christ was a contextualization of God's Word in Jewish flesh.
 - 1. He had a detailed record of His ancestry. Mt.1, Lk.3
 - 2. His longest recorded sermon (Mt.5,6,7) wrapped the Word in Jewish illustrations and life of the first century A.D.
 - 3. His discourses and sermons were in Jewish realities (Jn.4) and life (Lk.8) and not in theoretical doctrines.
- D. The Holy Spirit, Apostles and Early Church contextualized the Gospel.
 - 1. Acts 2:6-8 records that the Holy Spirit caused everyone to hear the Gospel in his own local dialect.
 - 2. The Hebrew "Messiah", "Jeshuah", etc. were not transliterated, but the actual Aramaic and Greek words having the identical meaning were used - Christ Jesus etc.
 - 3. The term "hades" was taken from Greek mythology where Hades was the god of the lower regions. "The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary" page 328
 - 4. Slavery was acknowledged (Eph.6:5) as a practice of that day.

5. Early Christians washed each others feet and kissed each other when meeting because it was the custom in that area.

III. Can the Chinese Church contextualize the Gospel to the extent that God wrapped His communications in Ancient Semitic flesh, Christ wrapped His communication in first century Jewish flesh, and the Holy Spirit wrapped and is wrapping His communication in the particular flesh of each tribe and people and nation where He indwells the Christian?

With nationalism at a pitch seldom surpassed in history (most recently seen in the Olympic Games in Canada), with the National Chinese Government calling for a revival of Chinese Culture, can the Chinese Church more effectively reach the unsaved and glorify God in a Chinese way by being a better Chinese than the unsaved Chinese. I say an unqualified YES!!!

- A. Can Chinese Christians SHOW the unsaved that they do honor their ancestors by having:
 1. A prominent chart of their ancestry?
 2. Good pictures of recent ancestors on the wall?
 3. Flowers in memory of their ancestors?
 4. Big funerals with parading and eating by MANY Christians to show their sorrow and oneness with the bereaved brother or sister in Christ?
 5. The prettiest and best kept graves in the graveyard?
 6. Memorial services on the anniversary of the birth and death of the ancestor?
 7. Memorial services each week for the first seven weeks after the death of an ancestor?
- B. Can Chinese Christians have the Gospel in Chinese Rhyme and sung to Chinese Tunes?
- C. Can Chinese Christians have a full God-honoring social life like the Jews of the Old Testament(Ex.23), Jesus(Mt.9), and the Early Christians?
 1. By eating together often.
 2. By observing Chinese Festivals to the Glory of God.
 - a. Chinese New Year instead of Christmas
 - b. Grave Sweeping Festival instead of Easter
- D. Can Chinese Christians give a cup of tea or pass out tracts with two hands to show respect to the person they approach?
- E. Can Chinese Christians bow & clasp their hands & call each other by terms fitting their relation with each other?
- F. Can Chinese Churches be beautiful as the Tabernacle or Solomon's Temple with Chinese Red(Joy) and gold and blue and purple(Ex.25)?

"For though I am free from all men(I don't have to be like the Chinese), I have made myself a slave(to all that is Chinese) to all, that I might win the more." I Cor.9:19 We are not sent to the Church but sent to the world of unsaved. The Pastor helps each Christian to fulfill his ministry of being a testimony to Christ at home; work and recreation. When the unsaved Chinese sees the fullness of a Chinese Christian life they will be drawn irresistably to Christ.

Just like the Judaizers fought to circumcise the Gentile Christians and keep them from eating pork, the Preachers and Older Chinese Christians will fight to keep "Christianity" for what they have known it to be. (If the King James was good enough for St. Paul, its good enough for me.) Change in religious forms is almost as traumatic as losing a member of

the family. Change, therefore, MUST COME SLOWLY AND WITH AS MUCH AGREEMENT AS POSSIBLE. The only reason for change is to make the Gospel an open option to the masses outside of Christ. A foreign religion is NOT an open option.

Ernest J. Boehr, Box 60, Miaoli 360

The following is an attempt to "think" the thoughts of an unchurched Taiwanese upon hearing a non-contextualized message. The thoughts of the unchurched are in parenthesis.

"Today I would like to speak to you about how much YehSoo (That religious leader opposed to our ancestors) loves us. (How can anyone destroying our ancestors love us. We depend on our ancestors for all.) Let me first read from the Holy Classics (Wonder what that book might be). In LooJya (Road Add) Happy News (This teaching is really foreign) the 15th chapter, verses 1-7, YehSoo tells the story of 100 wool goats. I will read the verses for you. 'Now all the tax-gatherers (No one gathers taxes here, we've got to take our money to the office) and the sinners (They must have been caught by the police.) were coming to YehSoo to listen to Him. And both the FahLeeSai (Law, Profit, Race) and the literary men began to grumble, saying, "This man receives sinners and eats with them." And YehSoo told them a parable saying, "What man among you, if he has 100 wool goats and has lost one of them, does not leave the 99 in open pasture, and go after the one which is lost, until he finds it? (That's crazy. The 99 would run away while he'd be looking for one) And when he comes home, he calls together his friends and his neighbors, saying to them, 'Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost.' I tell you that in the same way there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents, than over 99 righteous persons who need no repentance." ' "

"The shepherd described here is YehSoo. The lost wool goats describe us sinners, for we have all come short of God's standard (I haven't been caught at stealing nor have I killed any animal life. Furthermore, I'm no goat nor does a shepherd love his goats - he raises them for wool and meat.) YehSoo and His Father love us so much that even though we ran away from Him (I never entered a foreign religion. I'm faithful to my ancestors) the Heavenly Father sent His son YehSoo to this world (I wonder whom He calls the Heavenly Father! The Heavenly Mother must be Matsu) to die for our sins on the cross (We Chinese have had many wonderful men who gave their lives for justice and truth, what has YehSoo to do with me? What is a cross and how did YehSoo get on it to die?). YehSoo loves us so much that He and all heaven rejoice when one person trusts Him and becomes part of God's family (Who is this God - Tyan Gung?). Won't you trust in YehSoo and have your sins forgiven. You'll have peace and joy now and when you leave this earth, you will be forever with YehSoo in heaven (I'd rather be with my loved ones and friends in hell than go where I don't know anybody in a foreign place).

活에 參與하는 길입니다. 모든 것을 다 이루었다 하신 예수의 말씀은 受難이 끝났다는 뜻입니다. 受難의 죽음이 끝나고 勝利의 復活이 있었던 사실을 확실히 믿는 우리가 되어야겠습니다. 그러므로 우리는 이 時代에 처하여 새로운 生活을 살려고 할 때, 勝利가 거저 쉽게 오는 것이 아닙니다. 受難은 勝利에 到達하는 한 經路입니다. 受難의 準備, 受難, 勝利를 되새기고 經驗할 수 있다면 이 受難節을 紀念하는 意味가 되리라 생각합니다.

Theological Forum (Yonsei University)
Vol. XIV (July 1980)
Seoul, Korea

Types of Indigenization of the Korean Church and its Theology
韓國教會의 土着化 類型과 神學

Ryu Tong-shuk
柳 東 植*

I. 머리말

한 개의 外來宗教가 이 땅에서 100년을 살아 왔다. 그것도 겨우 延命이나 한 것이 아니라 날로 번창하는 종교 활동과 아울러 많은 文化的 結實을 남기며 살아 온 것이다. 이것이 한국의 기독교인 韓國教會이다. 그리고 보면 한국 교회는 분명히 이 땅에 뿌리를 든든히 내리고 土着化되었음이 분명하다.

土着化란 福音과 被宣敎地의 문화 및 역사적 전통과의 관계에 관한 개념이다. 기독교의 복음은 하나의 보편적인 진리이다. 모든 시대와 모든 민족 속에서 구원의 역사를 하는 종교적 진리이다. 그러나 그것이 막상 역사하는 데 있어서는 각 시대와 각 민족의 역사적 특수성과의 관계 밑에 이루어지기 마련이다. 한국에 있어서는 한국의 전통적 문화와의 相關 속에서 전개되었을 뿐만 아니라 19세기 말에서 20세기에 걸친 時代的 狀況 속에서 전개되었다. 여기에 한국 교회의 특수성이 있다.

한국 교회의 토착화 양상은 이것을 크게 세 개의 類型으로 나누어 볼 수 있다.

첫째는 초기 선교사들에 의해 심어진 기독교 이념의 保守的 土着化 양상이다. 전해 준 그대로를 이 땅에 뿌리 내리도록 하려는 保守的 傳統의

* 연세대학교 신과대학 종교학 교수

형성이다. 문제는 초기 선교사들의 기독교 이해의 유형에 있으나, 이것은 그 나름대로 도착하여 오늘의 한국 교회의 한 전통을 형성하였다.

둘째는 복음을 받아들인 한국 지도층 인사들에 의한 社會-政治的 복음 운동의 전개 양상이다. 말하자면 복음과 시대적 사회 상황과의 관계에서 이루어진 복음의 歷史化라는 형태의 土着化 양상이다. 복음을 받아들인 초기 한국의 지도층의 인사들은 亡國을 전후한 사회-정치적 위기 속에서 기독교적 구원의 의미를 찾았다. 開化와 民族의 獨立이야말로 당시 한국인에게서 구원의 내용을 차지하는 것이었다. 解放이 오고 민족의 독립이 이루어진 후로는 다시 社會正義의 실현과 人權을 위한 투쟁 등으로 그 전통이 이어져 갔다. 여기에 한국 교회의 한 토착화 유형이 있고 전통이 있다.

셋째는 전통적인 宗教文化와의 관련 속에서 전개되는 한국 교회의 獨自性의 형성이다. 특히 민중의 의식의 바닥을 흐르고 있는 巫敎와의 관련과 우리들의 생활 문화를 지배해 오던 儒敎와의 관련 속에서 한국 교회의 성격이 점차 형성되었던 것이다.

이러한 세 유형으로 나누어 볼 수 있는 한국 교회의 토착화 양상에는 각기 이를 지명하고 이끌어 가는 神學的 礎石이 있었다. 실로 교회와 선교와 신학은 나눌 수 없는 하나의 현상이라 하지 않을 수 없다. 그러므로 각 유형의 土着化 양상을 고찰함에 있어 우리는 당연히 그 신학적 기초와 흐름을 중심으로 하지 않을 수 없는 것이다.

끝으로 우리가 유의해야 할 점은, 이러한 세 유형의 토착화 현상이 있었음에도 불구하고 이들은 모두 하나의 한국 교회를 이루고 있다는 사실이다. 세 유형의 교회 전통은 相反되는 듯하면서도 서로 얽혀 있는 것이요, 셋은 서로 排他的인 관계에 있는 것이 아니라 서로 補完的인 관계를 이루고 있다는 것이다. 그러므로 앞으로의 신학적 과제는 이러한 세 양상의 특성을 가진 한국 교회가 그 선교적 사명을 완수하는 데 봉사할 수 있는 韓國神學의 수립에 있다 하겠다.

II. 初期 宣教師의 福音運動과 韓國 保守主義의 傳統

초기 선교사들은 미국의 근본주의적 보수주의 신앙을 배경으로 하고 있었으나 대체로 진진한 복음 이해를 가지고 있었다. 복음이란 인간을 구원하는 하나님의 진리이다. 그런데 성서적 인간관에 의하면 인간은 全人 곧 靈과 肉을 지닌 존재로 파악된다. 따라서 초기 선교사들에 의한 복음 운동은 이러한 全人救援을 위한 三大事業으로 전개되었다.

첫째는 靈의 人間解放을 위한 교회의 설립이다. 非正常的인 神人關係에서 비롯된 罪로부터의 인간 해방은 선교 운동의 중심 과제가 되지 않을 수 없다.

둘째는 病魔로부터의 인간 해방인 醫療事業이다. 예수님의 활동의 반을 차지한 것은 병자들을 고치는 일이었다. 비록 초기 선교 정책으로는 병원에서 치료를 받은 사람으로 하여금 고향에 자주 왕례케 함으로써 “전도의 문을 열도록 해야 한다”는 등¹⁾ 전도의 한 방편으로 되어 있었으나, 이것은 단순한 방편 이상의 복음적 의미를 갖는 사업이었다.

셋째로는 知的 인간 해방을 위한 교육 사업이다. 無知가 자아 내는 암흑 세계로부터의 인간 해방은 영적 해방에 못지 않은 구원의 의미를 지니고 있다. 성서 번역과 한글 문서 사업의 전개 역시 이러한 교육 사업의 일환으로 보아야 할 것이다.

이러한 三大事業은 한국 교회의 전통이 되었으며, 또한 여기에 한국 교회의 건질성이 있다. 그런데 한편 이러한 기본적인 교회 운동과 함께 초기 선교사들이 전해 준 청교도적인 윤리 사상과 근본주의적인 신학 사상을 또한 固守하려는 保守的 傳統이 형성되게 되었다.

한국 선교 반 세기를 기념하는 예배 석상에서 선교사 마펫 박사는 “초

1) 白雲潭, 韓國의 宣敎史, pp. 212f. 참조.

선 교회 형대에 40년 전에 진파한 그 복음을 그대로 전하자…… 원로 선교사와 원로 목사들의 진한 복음을 그대로 전하자”고 의쳤다.” 이것을 다시 이어 받고 발전시킨 이가 박亨龍 박사였다. 그는 1953년長老會神學校 교장 취임사에서 다음과 같이 말하였다.

우리는 우리 교회의 神學的 自我意識의 發現에 呼應하여 한국 교회 신학의 수립에 挺身할 것이다. 한국 교회 신학의 수립이란 결코 우리가 어떤 神學體系를 창작함이 아니라, 使徒의 傳統의 正信仰을 그대로 保守하는 神學, 우리 교회가 70年前 창립되던 당시에 받은 그 신학을 우리 교회의 永久한 소유로 확보함은 이룸이다.”

그리하면 우리 교회가 창립 당시에 선교사들에게서 받은 神學思想의 성격은 어떤 것이었을까? 당시 미국 장로교 외지 선교회 총무의 한 사람은 한국의 초기 선교사들을 다음과 같이 논평하고 있다.

처음 25년 간의 전형적인 선교사는 유리단 형의 사람이었다. 이들은 안식일을 지키고 우리 뉴잉글랜드 조상들이 한 세기 전에 행하던 것과 같이 지켰다. 춤이나 담배 그리고 카드 놀이 등은 기독교 신자들이 빠져서는 안 될 罪라고 보았다. 신학이나 성경을 비판할 때 이러한 선교사는 강력하게 보수주의적이었으며, 그리스도의 再臨에 관한 前千年의 견해를 없애서는 안 될 진리라고 주장했다. 高等批判主義와 自由主義의 신학은 위험한 異端으로 생각되었다.”

이와 같은 초기 선교사들의 청교도적인 律法主義와 保守主義의 正統主義神學을 확보하고 발전시킴으로써 한국의 保守主義神學의 傳統을 수립한 이는 박亨龍 박사였다.

한국 교회가 禧年을 맞이한 1935년은 한국 교회의 保守主義가 그 기반을 완성한 해였다. 1934년 제23회 장로회 총회에는 金英珠 목사가 모세의 창세기 지각을 부인했다는 문제와 金存培 목사가 쓴 글 중에 “女子는 조

2) 金良善, 韓國基督敎解放十年史, pp. 190f.

3) 上揭書, p. 263.

4) A. J. Brown, *The Mastery of the Far East* 1919, p. 540; 개인용, 神學指南, 33권 3집, p. 22.

용하라. 여자는 가르치지 말라고 한 것은 2천년 전의 한 지방 교회의 교훈과 풍습이요, 萬古不變의 진리는 아니다”라고 한 것이 모두 성서에 대한 비평이요 자유주의 신학 사상이라는 이유로 提訴되었다. 이에 대해 박형룡 박사를 중심으로 한 연구 위원회에서는 “모세의 창세기 지각을 부인하는 목사는 正確無誤한 성경을 모독한 자인고로 우리 교회의 교역가 됨을 거절함이 可하다”고 결론 지었고, 女權問題에 대하여는 성서에 여자 교권이 전혀 허용되어 있지 않음에도 불구하고 이와 같이 말하는 것은 성경을 시대 사조에 맞도록 자유로이 해석하는 처사임으로 마땅히 징계를 받아야 한다고 보고했다. 다음해 총회에서는 이 보고가 그대로 통과됨으로써 그들을 정죄하였다.”

35년 총회에서는 또한 감리교의 柳澄基 목사의 편집 번역인 아빙돈의 「單卷聖書註釋」이 자유주의 사상이라는 이유로 제소되었다. 그리하여 장로교회로서는 구독하지 않을 것과 장로교의 집필자들은 공개 사과할 것을 결의하였다. 이러한 결정을 발의하고 주동한 이는 초기 한국 장로교회의 기둥이었던 吉善宙 목사였다.”

禧年을 기념할 또 하나의 사건은 박亨龍 박사의 첫 저서 「基督敎近代神學難題選評」이 발간된 사실이다. 이것은 한국 최초의 조직 신학 저서인 동시에 8백여 면에 달하는 대작이었다. 이것은 “千態萬象의 異思想이 바야흐로 正統信仰의 존속을 위협하려는 이 때에 非正統的 神學諸說을 考査하여 비평을 가하기로 목적”한 저술이었다. 리츨, 바르트의 사상 등을 비판하고 또한 社會福音이나 高等批判을 비판함으로써 正統主義 保守神學을 체계화한 책이다. 이로써 한국의 根本主義의 保守主義神學의 초석이 완성된 셈이다. 그리고 그 중심을 이루고 있는 사상은 聖書の 逐字靈感說이다.

해방 후 박 박사는 방대한 敎義神學을 완성했다. 그는 시문에서 자기의 입장을 이렇게 밝히고 있다.

5) 金良善, 神學聖, pp. 176-185 참조.

핀자의 본의는 칼빈주의 개혁과 전통 신학을 그대로 받아서 전달하는 데 있고 감히 무엇을 창작하려는 것이 아니다. 팔십 년 전 이 땅에 서양 선교사들이 와서 건하여 온 그대로의 바른 신학을 새 세대에게 전달하는 것이 핀자의 임원이기 때문이다.

자기는 述而不作的 태도를 취한다고 했다. 그렇기 때문에 자기의 신학은 다른 사람들의 화원에서 깎여 모은 꽃다발에 지나지 못한다고 한다. 그의 꽃다발의 중심에는 벌코프의 「組織神學」(Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 1941)이 자리 잡고 있다. 그는 누차 자기의 신학은 벌코프와 倒立을 함께 한다고 했다. 그리고 “성경을 無誤한 하나님의 말씀으로 믿고 성경으로 더불어 도림을 함께 하였다”고 했다. 한국 보수주의 신학은 일단 여기에서 완성된 셈이다. 그 후 젊은 신학자들이 나왔으나 그 이상 발전의 여지가 없었다.

한국 교회의 삼분의 일 이상을 차지하고 있는 보수주의 계열의 사상에 기초를 완성해 준 이는 박형룡 박사였다. 현대 세계 교회와 신학의 움직임에 대한 한국 보수주의의 입장은 바로 이 박 박사의 사상에서 찾아야 한다. 그리고 그 사상은 대체로 세 문제로 집결된다.

첫째는 에큐메니칼 운동에 대한 태도이다. “이 운동은 교리적으로는 혼란한 自由主義의 지도 하에 움직이며 정책적으로는 世界單一教會의 구성을 최종 목표로 한다.” “異端邪說로 물러가는 것이 소위 자유주의 신학이요, 社會福音이요, WCC 에큐메니칼 운동이다.” 그러므로 “보수측 교회들의 일부가 WCC 에큐메니칼 운동의 세력권에 들어가니 그것이 위험한 일이다”고 본다.⁶⁾

둘째는 역사적 社會變動에 대한 태도이다. 그의 입장은 미국 인함장로교회가 새로이 작성한 信仰告白(1967)에 대한 비판 속에 종합적으로 나타났다. 12항에 달하는 비판 속에 중요한 것은 성경의 靈感을 부인하고 그리스도의 人性에 치중함으로써 기독교를 人造宗教로 만든다는 것이요

6 박형룡, 神學指南, 1958. 1집, 31권, 1집, 31권 2집 등 참고

또한 교회의 本務가 아닌 社會福音에 치중하고, 국제 문제에 대하여 위협한 길을 열어 놓는다는 것이다. 이것은 성경에 기초한 웨스트민스티 信道揭要에 반대되는 신앙 고백이라고 했다.⁷⁾

셋째는 他宗教에 대한 입장이다. 1966년 박 박사는 타종교에 대한 문제를 취급하면서 결론적으로 이렇게 말했다. “過去의 世界宣教會議와 그 후 국제신교협의회의가 기독교의 본래의 福音傳統을 確執하지 않고 자유주의로 흘러 變質해 가며 심지어 異教思想과 타협해 가는 태도를 취함은 매우 부당한 일이다. 기독교의 異教에 대한 適正한 관계는 妥協이 아니라 征服이다. …… 예수 그리스도의 이름을 가진 종교의 태도는 타협이 아니라 충돌이며 征服이다.”⁸⁾

요컨대 聖書無誤說과 靈感說을 기초로 한 보수주의 교회의 사상의 특성은 反에큐메니칼 운동적이며, 社會問題에 대하여는 無關心을 표명하며, 他宗教에 대하여는 征服的인 태도를 취하는 데 있다. 이것은 한국 保守主義教會의 傳統을 뒷받침하는 신학 사조이다.

한국 교회의 保守主義的 傳統이 지닌 교회사적 위치에 대해 金在俊 목사는 대략 다음과 같이 묘사한 적이 있다.

宗教改革者 時代 직후 생긴 正統主義神學과 그 逐字靈感說은 18세기에 이르러 歐州에서는 沒落의 쓴 잔을 마셨다. 그러나 그 殘兵들은 19세기 말 미국, 특히 프린스톤에 모여 反擊戰을 전개하였다. 허나 그것 역시 오래 가지 못하고 10여년의 악전고투 끝에 1929년을 기해 反動小數派로 전락되고 말았다. “그런데 이상하게도 이 19세기 말엽의 프린스톤 출신들이 韓國의 初代 宣教師로 나오게 되어 그 正統主義 神學의 沒落直前의 몸부림을 이 한국에 이식하고 철의 장막으로 둘러막아 50년을 보호 육성한 것이 곧 한국 장로교회의 正統主義王國인 것이다.”⁹⁾ 그러

7) “新舊信道揭要의 大相異”, 神學指南 31권 2집.

8) “異教에 대한 妥協問題”, 神學指南 33권 3집.

9) “大韓基督敎長老會의 歷史的 意義”, 신자군, 25호, 1955.

로 한국 교회는 이 정통주의에서 벗어날 때 비로소 세계 교회의 本流에 합류할 수 있는 것이며 또한 自主的인 韓國教會史의 第1步를 내디디게 될 것이라고 했다.

보수주의란 주어진 체계를 지키고 방어하는 데 그 특성이 있다. 따라서 새로운 개혁이나 전개라는 것을 피한다. 그러므로 한국 보수주의 진영을 지적 가는 신학 사조에서는 이렇다 할 발전을 기대할 수가 없다. 박형룡 박사의 체계화한 신학 사상이 있는 후 젊은 신학자들이 배출되기는 했으나 대체로 주어진 보수 신학의 변종으로 시종해 오는 것이 오늘날까지의 실정이다.

Ⅲ. 韓國教會의 社會-政治的 福音運動의 土着化

1. 人間解放으로서의 복음은 非人間化하는 社會-政治的 勢力으로부터의 해방을 또한 촉구한다. 인간은 인격적인 존재일 뿐만 아니라 사회-정치적인 존재이기 때문이다. 그런데 19세기 말의 한국은 오랜 封建主義의 온상에서 不正腐敗와 貪官汚吏들의 고풍이가 무성하여 社會와 國家는 崩壞의 위기에 처해 있었다. 그뿐 아니라 西歐에서 기세를 올리기 시작한 帝國主義的 侵略은 드디어 우리 나라에까지 손을 뻗어 日本, 中國, 러시아는 한국 침략의 角逐戰을 벌이고 있었다. 이러한 亡國的 환경에 직면한 우리 나라에서의 구원의 복음이 뜻하는 역사적 의미는 무엇이겠는가? 그것은 對內的 社會改革과 對外的 自主獨立의 爭取 외엔 없었다.

기독교의 복음이 전과된 지 불과 10여 년이 지나지 아니한 90년대엔 이미 상당수의 지도자층의 인사들이 그 복음을 믿고 받아들였다. 그리고 그들은 인간의 구원과 해방을 뜻하는 복음이 우리의 당시 현실에서는 무엇을 의미하는가를 분명히 포착했다. 그리하여 그들은 社會-政治的 福音運動을 전개하기 시작한 것이다. 이것은 실로 복음을 받아들인 한국인 크리스찬들의 主體的이요 土着的인 복음 운동의 전개였다. 왜냐하면

여기서부터 한국 크리스찬과 宣教師들의 福音展開의 路線이 갈라지기 때문이다.

선교사들은 1901년 長者會公議會를 열고 教會의 非政治化政策을 결의했던 것이다. 그 결의문의 내용을 요약하면 이렇하다.

1. 목사들은 나라 일과 정부 일에 간섭하지 않기로 장정한다.
2. 교회 일과 나라 일은 다르다. 따라서 교회는 나라 일에 간섭할 것이 아니다.
3. 그리스도인이 된 사람들도 황제를 충성히 받들고 관원에 복종해야 한다.
4. 교인이 나라 일에 실수하거나 범죄했을 때 교회는 이에 책임질 것이 아니다.
5. 교회는 예배하는 곳이다. 따라서 교회 안에서 나라 일을 공론해서는 아니 된다.¹⁰⁾

따라서 교회가 직접 정치나 사회적 분야에서 선교 운동을 펴지는 아니했다. 진척으로 선교사들의 지도 밑에 있던 당시 교회로서는 당연하였다. 그러나 하나님의 백성이 된 당시 그리스도인들은 그 時代的 要請에 應하여 다른 형태의 선교 운동을 전개했다. 그 전형적인 것이 그리스도인들이 主導하던 協成會와 獨立協會의 운동이었다. 1896년은 이러한 의미에서 한국 교회의 發展史上 획기적인 해였다. 그리고 그 지도적인 인물로는 徐載弼, 尹致昊, 李商在, 南宮億 諸氏들을 기억해야 할 것이다. 특히 한국인으로서 最初의 미국 神學留學生이었던 尹致昊 씨가 歸國 후 구 한국 시대에는 관리로 봉직했고, 亡國 후로는 YMCA 운동과 教育事業을 통해 시대적 요청에 대한 福音的 應答을 전개해 왔다는 사실을 기억해야 할 것이다.

이러한 사회-정치적 복음 운동은 일시 挫折狀態에 이르렀다. 그것은 당시 反改革的 保守政權의 탄압과 日本의 政治的 侵略, 그리고 선교사

10 그리스도신문 5-40호(1901.10.3.)

들의 교회의 非政治化政策 등에 부딪친 탓이라 하겠다. 그리하여 1905년 乙巳條約과 함께 亡國이 왔다. 그러나 이러한 그리스도인 지도층들은 굴하지 아니하고 새로운 형태를 찾아 社會改革과 民族의 自主獨立이라는 당시의 선교적 과제를 수행하도록 했다. 1903년에 창립된 한국 YMCA 운동은 그 한 중심이었다. 그리고 1919년의 3·1獨立運動을 출발점으로 한 抗日獨立運動은 한국 교회의 한 기본적인 선교 자세였다. 1938년의 神社參拜 문제를 둘러싼 교회의 투쟁 역시 이러한 한국 교회의 脈絡 속에서 이해해야 할 것이다.

1945년을 기해 民族의 解放과 獨立이 왔다. 이제 우리들의 爭點의 하나는 없어졌다. 그러나 社會-政治의 문제는 또 다른 次元에서 한국 교회에 도전해 왔다. 그것은 社會正義와 人權 문제였다. 그리하여 60년대 이후의 한국 교회는 正義와 人權 문제에 깊이 관여하게 된 것이다. 여기에 한국 교회의 한 土着化의 類型과 傳統이 형성되었다.

社會-政治的 福音展開 또는 그리스도인의 歷史參與에 관한 神學的 礎石을 놓은 이는 金在俊 목사이다. 그의 歷史意識을 자극하고 그의 사상적 기초를 구축한 것은 豫言者研究였다. 1933년 美國留學으로부터 돌아와서 3년 간에 발표한 그의 주요 논문은 예레미야, 아모스, 이사야 등 예언자에 관한 연구였다. 예레미야는 “不純한 儀式的 國家的 宗教는 道德的 靈的 個人的 宗教로 淨化되어서 그리스도의 길을 예비”하는 데 이바지했다. 義 사모하기를 주리고 목마른 자 같이 하는 아모스는 “온 世上의 政治, 經濟, 宗教, 教育者의 모든 關係가 하나님의 義 위에 세워지고 運行하여지기를 바라고 그를 위하여 싸우다가 그를 위하여 죽은 자이다.” 이러한 예언자들의 신학을 체받아 “이제 우리는 이 不義로 가득 찬 세대에 있어서 이 義의 豫言者의 勇氣를 부러워함과 동시에 이 예언자의 義를 이루어 주신 그리스도의 義만을 선포하며 그를 위하여 분투하며 또한 생명을 버림이 마땅할 것인가 한다”고 그는 선언했다.¹¹⁾

11) “아모스의 生涯와 그 豫言”, 神學論壇 15권 6호 (1933).

1945년 그의 論文의 중심은 歷史參與를 댄돌고 있다. 그 중에도 대표적인 것이 “歷史參與의 문제와 우리의 實存”(1958)이다. “기독교에는 본래 二元的인 要素가 있다. 하나님과 사람, 來世와 現世, 律法과 恩寵, 하나님의 것과 가이사의 것”등이 그것이다. 크리스찬은 이 두 極 사이에서 긴장된 생활을 해야만 한다. 그런데 “우리 한국에 소개된 기독교는 주로 正統主義神學을 體系로 받아들인 것이었다. 그들은 주로 反文化的이며 극히 他界的이다.” 그러므로 한국에서는 불교와 마찬가지로 “역사에서의 遊離와 도피를 가져 왔으며 이런 것을 기독교적 ‘神聖’이라고 오인하게 한 것이다.”

그러나 우리는 歷史的 現實을 도피할 수 없다. 歷史의 觀客일 수는 없다. “누구든지 다 劇中人物이 되어야 한다. 사건의 한가운데 서서 십자가의 道를 너 자신 연출하라. 이것이 크리스찬으로서 오늘에 實存한다는 뜻이다.” “크리스찬이 역사에 대하는 태도란 언제나 救贖史의 입장과 성격 안에서 이 현실의 역사를 비관해야 하며, 동시에 그 역사로 하여금 구원의 목표를 指向하게 하여야 할 것이다. 이 비관과 指向에서 크리스찬은 十字架를 각오하지 않을 수 없게 된다.” “우리는 십자가의 어리석음을 무기로 贖良社會를 세워 가며, 贖良倫理가 고요히 이 罪惡史 가운데에 누룩같이 피어 들 수 있도록 하는 데서만 우리 한국 민족에게서 새로운 形態의 人間實存을 하나씩 들썩 찾아 볼 수 있게 되리라고 믿는다.” 여기 그가 말하는 歷史參與의 眞意가 있다.¹²⁾

한국 교회의 구체적 歷史參與의 사명에 대하여 그는 또한 다음과 같이 밝히었다.

“우리는 이제 이 韓國을 우리의 素材로 받았다. 우리는 한국 역사 안에 그리스도의 贖良歷史를 조성하며 한국 역사를 그리스도의 天國歷史로 변질시키는 업무를 하나님께로부터 받은 것이다.……그리스도가 하늘의 寶庫를 버리고 人間歷史 안에 成肉身하셔서 이 역사의 구원을 위해 그 피의 최후의 한 방울까지

12) “歷史參與의 문제와 우리의 實存”, 基督敎思想 제2권 3호 (1958).

님김 없이 쏟아 땅에 묻힌 한 알의 밀이 되신 것같이 그리스찬도 歷史 안에 보냄을 받은 것은 역사에서 도피하라는 것이 아니라 歷史 안에 그 全存在를 쏟아 그리스도의 육량 의식에 충성하라는 데 그 소명이 있는 것이다. 그러므로 우리는 이 주어진 韓國의 政治, 經濟, 教育, 文化의 各部門에 그리스도의 精神이 그 造形理念이 되며 '魂'이 되게 하는 데 책임적으로 진력해야 한다."¹³⁾

保守的 正統主義의 신학 사상과 그 路線을 달리한 金在俊 목사의 福音理解는 전통과 지도자들과의 긴 神學論爭 끝에 드디어 예수教 長老會에서 분리하여 새로 基督教長老會를 설립하게 되었다(1953). 그리고 그 신학 전개의 본부가 된 것은 金 목사가 주동이 되어 온 조선신학교(1940년 설립) 곧 오늘의 韓國神學大學이다. 한국신학대학을 무대로 金在俊 목사의 신학 사상은 구체적으로 展開되어 갔다. 조직 신학, 기독교 윤리, 신약 신학, 구약 신학, 기독교 교육 등 각 분야에서 역사 참여의 신학 또는 사회-정치적 福音理解의 발전적 노력이 이루어지고 있다. 그리고 그 신학자들은 단순히 책상에 머물러 있지 아니하고 신학을 행동으로 옮기는 전통을 만들었다. 여기 한국 교회의 土着化의 한 類型과 그 전통이 있다.

IV. 傳統的 宗教文化와 韓國教會의 土着化 樣相

기독교와 他宗教와의 대화 문제가 제기되기 시작한 것은 최근의 일이다. 그러나 기독교와 다종교와의 內面的인 對話가 진행된 것은 이미 오랜 역사적 사실이다. 이 땅에 복음이 傳來되었을 때부터였다. 그리하여 우리가 비록 의식하고 계획한 것은 아니었지만 기독교는 그 土着化 過程에서 적지 않게 타종교의 영향을 받아 왔다.

한국의 전통적인 宗教文化로는 巫教, 佛敎, 儒敎가 있다. 巫敎는 우리들의 土着宗教로서 古代로부터 우리의 意識構造를 지배해 온 종교이다. 外來宗教文化에 억압되어 外形上으로는 그 지배적 현상이 사라진 지 오래다. 그러나 실질적으로는 우리의 生活文化의 底邊에 깔려 있으면서

13) "大韓基督敎長老會의 歷史的 意義" 십자군 25호 (1956).

오늘날까지 우리에게 영향력을 발휘하고 있다. 예컨대 年中行事의 대부분이 무교적 관념과 연결되어 있다는 사실이다. 儒敎는 李朝五百年의 한국 문화의 指導理念의 구실을 해 왔다. 따라서 우리들의 生活文化는 또한 다분히 유교적인 관념에 의해 지배되고 있다. 우리들의 冠婚喪祭만 보아도 그러하다. 이에 비해 佛敎는 오랜 세월을 두고 우리 문화를 지배했고, 또 오늘에도 많은 信徒가 있음에도 불구하고 비교적 우리들의 生活文化에까지 영향을 주고 있지 못하다. 그것은 필경 佛敎가 다분히 巫敎와 習合되었다는 사실과, 李朝時代의 排佛崇儒 정책에 기인한 것으로 생각된다. 따라서 한국 기독교의 토착화 과정에서 중요한 영향력을 발휘한 것은 巫敎와 儒敎였다고 하겠다.

A) 巫敎文化와 기독교

무교는 기독교와 함께 北方狩牧 文化를 배경으로 한 종교 현상이다. 따라서 거기에는 공통된 世界觀이나 觀念이 있다. 예컨대 세계를 三層構造로 본다면, 天神 곧 하느님을 主宰神으로 믿는다면, 하느님이 세상으로 降臨한다든가 하는 것들이다. 무교적 창작이라 할 수 있는 檀君神話의 구조는 기독교적인 세계관과 흡사하다. 이러한 관념을 가진 무교를 바탕으로 한 우리들에게 기독교가 전해지자 우리는 쉽게 이것을 이해하고 또한 받아들일 수가 있었다.

물론 이러한 接觸과 融合 속에는 거기에 적극적으로 평가될 수 있는 면과 함께 否定的으로 평가되어야만 할 면이 있다.

첫째, 그 적극적인 면에 있어 우리는 먼저 한국 교회가 지닌 宗教의 熱情과 活氣를 지적할 수 있다. 復興會는 전형적인 표현이다. 한국 초대 교회로부터 오늘에 이르기까지 부흥회는 한국 교회의 한 生理로 土着化되었다. 부흥회는 聖靈을 강조하며 기도에 힘쓴다. 한국 교회의 한 자랑인 새벽 기도회는 이러한 부흥회의 다른 표현이라고 생각된다. 그러면 이러한 한국적 信仰熱의 기원은 어디서 찾을 것인가? 이에 직접적인 해

남을 줄 수 있는 것이 무교라고 생각된다. 歌舞降神하여 除災招福을 기원하는 곳의 熱情은 종교적 活力的 한 극치에 속한다. 우리는 고요한 종교를 생각할 수는 없다. 예로부터 노래와 춤으로써 하느님에게 제사를 드려 오던 민족이다. 명상의 종교야 할 佛敎마지도 한국에 와서는 祝祭의 종교로 化되었던 것이다(燃燈, 八關會 등). 이러한 巫敎의 性格은 기독교의 신앙 양상과 잘 부합되는 것이었다.

한국의 방방곡곡에는 十字架를 높이 매단 敎會堂이 시 있다. 한국은 마치 기독교 왕국과도 같은 인상을 받는다. 都市에는 무수히 교회당들이 올라가고 있다. 이것은 우리들의 신앙의 표현임에 틀림 없다. 그러나 그 구체적인 요인으로는 다음 두 가지를 생각할 수 있다. 하나는 敎人들의 獻金熱이고, 또 하나는 宗教的 功德에 대한 열정이다. 그리고 이것은 모두 하나님으로부터의 祝福의 관념과 결부되어 있다. 그런데 이러한 獻金과 功德의 관념은 巫敎的 傳統에 속하는 것이다. 무교란 祈福의 종교요, 福을 받기 위해서는 獻納의 功德이 있어야만 하는 것이다. 한국 교회의 장식에 十字架의 상징을 많이 사용할 뿐만 아니라, 신도들의 문패에도 빨간 십자가의 마크를 모두 달고 있다는 것 역시 한국 교회의 한 특색이다. 이것 역시 符籙의 受持功德의 관념이 적지 않게 작용하고 있다고 생각된다.

요컨대 한국 교회의 신앙적 적극성을 형성하는 데에는 巫敎가 크게 작용하고 있다고 해서 과언이 아닐 것이다.

다음으로 否定的인 면을 들어 본다면, 첫째, 우리들의 신앙의 내용이 다분히 巫敎的인 除災招福의 관념으로 지배되고 있다는 점일 것이다. 心靈과 人格의 문제이기보다는 어떻게 五福을 누리느냐에 보다 깊은 관심이 있는 것이 우리들의 실정이 아닌가 한다.

이것은 곧 다음의 문제성을 야기한다. 곧 歷史意識과 共同體觀念이 약하다는 점이다. 한국 교회가 그 엘리뜨 신도들로 말미암아 社會-政治的 福首展開의 傳統을 土着化시키고 있음에도 불구하고 일반 교인들의

歷史意識은 극히 약한 차원에 머물러 있다. 이것은 巫敎가 지닌 기본 성격에 유래하는 것이라 하겠다.

B) 儒敎文化와 기독교

三綱五倫과 修身, 濟家, 治國, 平天下를 기조 이념으로 하는 儒敎의 倫理는 기독교 윤리와 모순될 것이 없다. 따라서 유교와 기독교는 직접적인 대화와 교섭 관계가 이루어짐직 했다. 그러나 우리 나라에서의 역사적 실정은 그렇지가 아니했다. 祖上에 대한 祭祀問題를 둘러싸고 두 종교는 相克의 성격으로 나타났다. 제사는 유교의 증신적인 종교 의례에 속한다. 그런데 기독교는 이것을 우상 숭배라고 배척했던 것이다. 또 하나의 相克現象이 일어났다. 그것은 유교적 이념 위에 구축된 常班의 社會秩序가 기독교의 平等理念으로 말미암아 무너지게 된다는 것이다. 이것은 누차에 걸친 카톨릭의 敎難을 통해 들어난 사실이었다.

그러나 두교의 경우와 마찬가지로 우리들의 心性 속에서 內面的 交涉 관계는 처음부터 이루어지고 있었으며, 이것이 또한 한국 교회의 성격 형성에 크게 작용해 왔다. 몇 가지 실례를 들어 본다.

첫째, 한국 교회가 지닌 律法主義的 性格이다. 聖守日, 제사 문제, 酒草 문제 등은 한국 교인들의 成敗를 가름하는 信仰條件으로 되어 왔다. 이것은 단순히 초기 선교사들의 교훈 때문만이 아니다. 생활의 에토스를 종교의 중심 과제로 생각하는 유교적 전통이 뒷받침되어 이러한 한국 교회의 성격이 형성되었다. 문제는 이러한 形式倫理가 종교의 本質을 상실하게 한다는 데 있다.

둘째, 한국 교회가 지닌 권협한 黨派性과 그 分裂的인 성향은 四色黨爭의 오랜 전통의 한 유산으로 생각된다. 그런데 이러한 黨爭의 배후에는 유교가 지지 않은 작용을 해 왔다. 朱子學의 전통을 벗어난 모든 사상은 斯文亂賊이라 하여 이를 배척해 왔다. 그런데 한국 교회의 保守的 傳統은 그들이 받아들인 처음의 신학적 배경을 전대시하고 이것을 벗어

나는 것은 新神學이나 自由主義나 하여 異端視하고 배척해 버리는 생리를 구축해 온 것이다.

셋째, 한국 교회의 한 자랑거리는 聖書研究에 비상한 관심을 가지고 있다는 것이다. 우리 나라의 부흥회는 五經會를 기초로 하였고, 모든 신도들은 반드시 성경을 소지하고 또한 읽고 외우는 것을 의무로 생각해 왔다. 그렇기 때문에 聖書解釋의 문제는 일반 신도들에게도 민감히 반영되었다. 우리 나라에서 正統이나 異端이나 하는 것은 단순히 聖書를 어떻게 보느냐에 의해서 판단되게 마련이다. 이러한 聖書主義의 성격을 부식한 것은 儒敎的 經學의 전통이었다고 생각한다. 유교는 四書三經의 訓詁學에 그 기초를 두고 있다. 經書를 읽고 외우는 데서 유교적 훈련이 시작된다. 이러한 전통을 물려 받은 것이 한국 기독교의 聖書主義가 아닌가 한다.

끝으로 한국 교회의 특성의 하나인 社會-政治的 教育運動의 정신적 기초를 준 것 역시 儒敎精神이었다고 생각한다. 유교란 그 본질상 經世學이기 때문이다.

이상 개관해 본 바와 같이 한국 교회의 土着的 性格 형성에는 전통적인 종교 문화와의 內面的 接觸이 크게 작용하였다. 이것은 결코 意圖的인 神學的 노력에 의한 것이 아니라 우리들의 宗教的 心性을 통해 자연스럽게 이루어진 현상이다. 그러나 한편 積極的인 神學的 反省이 없었던 것은 아니다. 儒敎로부터 기독교로 改宗한 초기 지도자들로부터 시작하여 현대 神學者에 이르기까지 他宗教와의 對話 문제를 다루어 왔다. 이러한 神學的 노력의 기초를 만든 이는 貞洞第一監理敎會의 첫 韓人 담임 목사였던 崔炳憲 씨였다.

崔 목사의 일생의 신학적 과제는 在來宗教와 기독교와의 만남의 문제를 해명하는 데 있었다. 그가 이 문제를 그의 학문적 주제로 삼은 데에는 거기에 두 가지의 현실적 요청이 있었다. 첫째는 자기 자신 안에서의 實在的인 문제였다. 그는 나이 30여 세에 이르도록 儒學으로 몸이 굳은 분

이다. 따라서 그가 기독교로 轉換한 데에는 거기에 그만한 事由가 있는 것이며, 이를 학문적으로 규명해야만 했다. 또 하나는 당시의 宣敎의 狀況이었다. 儒, 佛, 仙을 위시로 각종 전통적인 종교 신앙 속에 살고 있는 거레에게 그리스도의 福音을 전해야만 했던 것이다. 따라서 선교의 일선에 서 있는 그로서는 마땅히 在來宗教와 기독교와의 관계를 규명해야만 했다. 이 문제에 대한 그의 대표적인 저작은 “성산유람기”(1907)와 “宗教辨證論”(1916~20)의 連載이다. 각각 神學誌「신학월보」와「神學世界」에 연재되었다. 他宗教와 기독교와의 관계에 대한 그의 신학적 입장은 다음 서너 가지 명제로 요약된다.

1. 相對的 絕對主義와 聖書的 絕對主義

종교 현상이 지닌 相對的 絕對主義를 논한다. 기독교를 포함한 세계의 諸宗教들은 모두 제각기 자기의 종교가 최고의 진리를 가진 절대적인 것이라고 주장한다는 것이다. “皆言하기를 吾敎는 天下의 眞宗教라 하나니……誰가 鳥의 雌雄을 知하리오.” 이런 점에서는 기독교 역시 종교로서는 例外가 아니다. 특히 歷史的 敎會의 타락을 지지함으로써 역사적 기독교는 결코 절대적인 것이 아니라고 한다.

한편 이러한 종교의 相對的 性格을 판단케 하는 기초를 제공해 주는 것이 聖書라고 주장한다. 聖書에 증언된 그리스도의 진리만이 絕對라고 한다. 요컨대 성서에 증언된 그리스도의 福音과 종교로서의 기독교와는 구별되어야 한다는 것이다. 여기에 崔 목사가 신봉한 聖書的 絕對主義가 있다.

2. 辨證法的 肯定과 否定

종교로서의 기독교는 他宗教와의 連續性이 있다. 그러나 그리스도의 福音과 他宗教와의 사이에는 연속성이 있을 수 없다고 본다. 여기에 肯定과 否定의 辨證法的인 입장이 있다. 이 점에 대하여 누차 言及한 그는 특히 儒敎와의 관계에 있어 더욱 분명히 한다.

“宗教의 理는 三大觀念이 있으니, 一曰 有神論의 觀念, 二曰 來世論의

觀念이요, 三曰 信仰論의 觀念이다.” 성서가 제시하는 이러한 三大觀念에 비추어 볼 때 각 종교는 肯定的이면서 동시에 否定的으로 평가될 수밖에 없다. 그는 유교의 敬天思想에 대하여 이렇게 말한다.

儒家聖賢들이 上帝를 敬畏하며 崇拜치 아닌 이가 無하고, 且 儒家에서 敬畏하는 上帝는……天地를 管理하시는 造化의 主宰를 稱함이니 耶蘇教會의 獨一無二하시며 全知全能하신 華和上主와 一이시요, 堯舜禹湯과 周之文武는 上主를 敬畏함이 猶太의 大衛王과 所羅門과 略同하다.¹⁴⁾

곧 儒敎와 기독교의 上帝觀에는 連續性이 있다는 肯定的인 입장을 취한다. 그러나 그럼에도 불구하고 유교의 上帝는 기독교의 하나님과는 같지 않다는 것을 또한 밝힌다.

詩書論孟의 書를 究覽하면 人神의 關係가 敬畏崇拜에 不過하고, 上主의 親愛하신 恩典과 應許의 立約이 無하며, 天國의 臣民과 永生의 理가 無하니, 此는 眞正 耶穌의 代贖敎義하신 理를 不知不聞함이라.¹⁵⁾

요컨대 유교의 上帝는 하나님이긴 하나 기독교에서 말하는 바 우리를 親愛하시고 구원하시는 하나님은 아니라는 것이다. 유교의 上帝는 人間이 敬畏하고 제사하는 神이요, 聖書의 神은 그가 인간을 사랑하고 구하는 존재이다. 여기에 성서적 입장에서 본 타종교의 긍정과 부정의 변증법이 있다.

3. 萬宗의 成就로서의 그리스도

他宗教에 대한 肯定과 否定的인 論理의 근거에는 모든 종교가 하나님의 창조하신 세계 안에 있는 文化現象이라는 것과, 따라서 하나님의 아들인 그리스도의 福音은 모든 종교의 到達點이며 完成點이라는 신앙이 들어 있다. 그리스도의 복음이 나타나기까지는 諸宗教가 지닌 역사적인 사명과 의미가 있다. 그러나 그리스도가 나타난 이후에는 그 의미가 변한다.

14) 萬宗一 (1922), pp. 10f.

15) 上場海, 同前

崔 목사는 불교도와와의 대화 가운데서 이렇게 표현한다.

蔬食菜粥과 膏粱玉食이 다같이 음식이로되 貴賤과 美惡이 있나니 玉食을 만나지 못하여서는 草食을 먹으려니와 玉食을 보고도 疑心하며 먹지 아니하면 실로 어리석은 사람의 지혜 없는 일이다.¹⁶⁾

그는 또한 儒敎와 佛敎를 논한 다음 이런 말로써 그의 결론을 내리고 있다. “若使孔夫子로 基督의 理를 見하셨다면 必也信從이시오, 釋迦氏로 損己利人의 善果를 嘗하였더라면 苦行林中에 六年風霜을 虛勞치 아니실지라.”¹⁷⁾ 곧 東洋의 聖賢들이 구하던 진리는 그리스도 안에서 成就되었다는 말이다. 崔목사는 正統神學에서처럼 他宗教에 대해 排他的이며 獨善의 자세를 취하지 아니했다. 그러나 또 客觀的인 宗教學에서처럼 相對主義를 택한 것도 아니다. 그는 실로 福音的인 입장에서 他宗教와의 創造的인 接近을 시도했던 것이다.

崔如憲 목사에 의해 첫 초석이 놓여진 他宗教와의 對話的인 神學은 그 후 많은 攪亂과 挫折 속에 망각되어 왔다. 그러나 60年代 이후 監理敎 神學者들 속에 다시 살아나기 시작했다. 儒敎와 기독교, 佛敎와 기독교, 巫敎와 기독교 사이의 관계에 대한 구체적인 연구가 진행되기 시작한 것이다. 여기에 傳統的인 宗教文化와의 관계라는 또 하나의 土着化類型과 神學의 흐름이 있다.

V. 맺는 말

신교 백 년을 맞이하려는 한국 교회는 이제 그 독자적인 성격을 형성하게 되었다. 기독교는 한국의 역사와 문화적 환경 속에 土着化된 것이며, 한국적인 傳統을 형성하게 되었다. 그리고 그것은 위에서 살펴본 바와 같이 세 개의 類型으로 나누어 볼 수 있는 전통으로 구성되어 있다. 그 세

16) 신학원보, pp. 230f.

17) 萬宗一, p. 91.

개는 각기 독자성을 지니고 있을 뿐만 아니라 어떤 면에서는 相互矛盾된 것으로도 보인다. 그러나 여기에서 우리가 다시 한 번 반성하고 유의해 보지 않으면 안 될 것이 있다. 그것은 곧 이러한 세 개의 전통이 실은 하나의 韓國敎會를 형성하고 있다는 사실이다. 한국 교회의 전통은 하나이다. 그런데 그 하나는 세 개의 獨自의인 傳統과 土着化의 類型으로 구성되어 있다. 이것은 마치 화로에 사용되는 삼발[三鼎]과도 같다. 하나의 동그라미를 유지하고 미 받들고 있는 세개의 발과 같다는 말이다. 따라서 이 셋은 서로 排他的인 입장에서 있는 것이 아니라 相互補充的인 위치에서 있는 것이다. 한국 교회의 세 전통 역시 그러하다. 保守的傳統과 社會-歷史的 福音 운동의 전통은 서로 비판하고 배치할 것이 아니라 서로 존중하지 않으면 아니 된다. 제각기 자기에게 없는 것을 상대방에서 찾아 보완하지 않으면 아니 된다. 왜냐하면 자기들의 전통은 그리스도의 복음의 일부를 보존하고 지키고 있는 데 불과하다는 사실을 자각해야 하기 때문이다. 이것은 在來宗教文化와의 관련 속에서 土着化를 이룩한 전통과 다른 두 전통과의 관계에 있어서도 그러하다. 그리스도를 머리로 한 敎會의 세 肢體라고 생각하는 것이 옳을 것 같다.

이러한 한국 교회의 세 전통을 지탱케 하는 神學의 세 조류의 경우도 마찬가지다. 예長神學大學의 신학과, 韓國神學大學의 신학 그리고 監理敎神學大學의 신학은 각기 그 전통을 지켜 나가면서 서로 존중하고 협조하며 서로 배우도록 해야만 할 것이다. 내게 없는 것을 상대방에서 발견하고 자기를 補充하는 여기에 온전한 한국 교회의 전통을 지탱케 나갈 韓國神學이 형성되게 될 것이다. 韓國的 神學이란 한국의 교회 전통 전체를 뒷받침하는 신학이어야만 한다.

한국의 이러한 韓國的 神學의 형성은 모든 神學校가 공동으로 지니고 있는 課題라고 생각한다. 그러나 이러한 韓國神學形成을 위해 가장 이상적인 위치에 있는 神學機關이 있다면 그것은 종합 대학으로서의 延世大學校 안에 있는 神學大學일 것이다. 거기에는 두 가지의 이유가 있다.

하나는 文化現象 전체를 연구하는 종합 대학을 배경으로 하고 있다는 점이다. 한국 교회는 한국 문화 전체와 관계된 福音運動의 중심 기관이기 때문이다. 또 하나는 각 교파의 聯合機關이라는 점이다. 하나의 교회 교파적 전통만을 배경으로 한 교육 기관이 아니다. 따라서 하나의 전통을 지키도록 강요될 수 없는 기관이다. 적극적으로 말하면 예長, 기長, 監理敎, 聖公會 등 각기 구축해 온 전통을 한 곳으로 모으고 하나의 새로운 神學 곧 한국 교회의 장래를 힘 있게 뒷받침해 나갈 韓國神學을 形成할 神學機關이 되어야 할 것이다. 여기에 延世神學의 課題와 性格이 있다.

끝으로 한국 신학 형성을 위한 또 하나의 유의점을 지적하고 싶다. 그것은 이천 년의 교회 전통과 현대 한국 문화와의 상황적인 관계 밑에서 한국 신학이 형성될 뿐만 아니라, 수천 년에 달하는 韓國의 文化的 傳統이 지닌 精神的 遺産과도 관계되어야 한다는 점이다. 요컨대 우리의 전통 문화가 지닌 정신적 유산을 福音化함으로써 한국의 歷史形成에 이바지하도록 해야 한다는 것이다.

THEOLOGICAL FORUM

Vols. XIV / July, 1980

Edited by College of Theology

YONSEI UNIVERSITY

SEOUL, KOREA

CONTENTS

The Meaning of the Lent...*President Emeritus L. George Paik*... 1

Types of Indigenization of the Korean Church
and Its Theology*Prof. Tong Shik Ryu*... 11

Ideology and Utopia.....*Prof. Tai Dong Han*... 33

A Study on the Creation Tradition
in Second Isaiah*Dr. Chan Kook Gim*... 43

Karl Barth's Theory of Knowledge
of God*Prof. Kyuun Jin Kim*... 97

Religious Philosophy and Theological
Structure of Schleiermacher.....*Dr. Soong Hong Han*... 131

A Methodological Analysis on the Idea
of the Responsible Society.....*Prof. Jung Ki Kim*... 153

Nietzsche's Interpretation
of Conscience*Chaplain Chung Yang Kim*... 171

Indigenous Tradition of Korean Religions...*Dr. Wi Jo Kang*... 189

Whitehead Revised.....*Mr. Nak Joong Kim*... 221

神學論壇

第十四輯

延世大學校 神科大學

神學論壇

第 14 輯

1980年 7月

延世大學校 神科大學

